DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 213 SP 025 341

AUTHOR Henderson, Ronald W.
TITLE Teacher Relations with Minority Students and Their Families.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. National Support Systems Project.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE Sep 82
GRANT OEG007902045
NOTE 112p.; For other modules in this series, see ED 238 844 and SP 025 332-354. For the genesis of these modules, see ED 186 399. Reviewed by Cordell Wynn and Thomas Oakland.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; Ethnic Stereotypes; Family Characteristics; *Family School Relationship; Higher Education; Learning Modules; Learning Processes; *Mainstreaming; *Minority Groups; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Educators; Teacher Response
IDENTIFIERS Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

This module (part of a series of 24 modules) is on how stereotyped conceptions of minority children and their families may influence teachers' expectations and affect student achievement. The genesis of these materials is in the 10 "clusters of capabilities," outlined in the paper, "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education." These clusters form the proposed core of professional knowledge needed by teachers in the future. The module is to be used by teacher educators to reexamine and enhance their current practice in preparing classroom teachers to work competently and comfortably with children who have a wide range of individual needs. The module includes objectives, scales for assessing the degree to which the identified knowledge and practices are prevalent in an existing teacher education program, and self-assessment test items. Topics discussed in this module include cultural diversity and ethnic stereotyping, characteristics of minority children and their families, and teacher expectations and student performance. A bibliography and journal articles are included on racial and cultural variations among American families, and the effect of cultural differences on the academic achievement of Mexican American children. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249213

TEACHER RELATIONS WITH MINORITY STUDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES

PREPARED BY

RONALD W. HENDERSON

REVIEWED BY

CORDELL WYNN

THOMAS OAKLAND

September 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 025 341
SP025341

These materials are developed pursuant to Grant No. OEG007902045 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education. The points of view expressed herein are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Special Education Office or the U.S. Department of Education. No official endorsement is intended.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

1982

Development. Materials are developed under direction of the National Support Systems Project, University of Minnesota, under the Grant No. referenced above.

Distribution. Materials are available through The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036. For information on costs and distribution, contact that office.

Extending the Challenge:

Working Toward a Common Body of Practice for Teachers

Concerned educators have always wrestled with issues of excellence and professional development. It is argued, in the paper "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education,"* that the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 provides the necessary impetus for a concerted reexamination of teacher education. Further, it is argued that this reexamination should enhance the process of establishing a body of knowledge common to the members of the teaching profession. The paper continued, then, by outlining clusters of capabilities that may be included in the common body of knowledge. These clusters of capabilities provide the basis for the following materials.

The materials are oriented toward assessment and development. First, the various components, rating scales, self-assessments, sets of objectives, and respective rationale and knowledge bases are designed to enable teacher educators to assess current practice relative to the knowledge, skills, and commitments outlined in the aforementioned paper. The assessment is conducted not necessarily to determine the worthiness of a program or practice, but rather to reexamine current practice in order to articulate essential common elements of teacher education. In effect then, the "challenge" paper and the ensuing materials incite further discussion regarding a common body of practice for teachers.

Second and closely aligned to assessment is the developmental perspective offered by these materials. The assessment process allows the user to

*Published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC, 1980 ($5.50).

view current practice on a developmental continuum. Therefore, desired or more appropriate practice is readily identifiable. On another, perhaps more important dimension, the "challenge" paper and these materials focus discussion on preservice teacher education. In making decisions regarding a common body of practice it is essential that specific knowledge, skill, and commitment be acquired at the preservice level. It is also essential that other additional specific knowledge, skill, and commitment be acquired as a teacher is inducted into the profession and matures with years of experience. Differentiating among these levels of professional development is paramount. These materials can be used in forums in which focused discussion will explicate better the necessary elements of preservice teacher education. This explication will then allow more productive discourse on the necessary capabilities of beginning teachers and the necessary capabilities of experienced teachers.

In brief, this work is an effort to capitalize on the creative ferment of the teaching profession in striving toward excellence and professional development. The work is to be viewed as evolutionary and formative. Contributions from our colleagues are heartily welcomed.

This paper presents one module in a series of resource materials which are designed for use by teacher educators. The genesis of these materials is in the ten "clusters of capabilities," outlined in the paper, "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of Public Law 94-142 to Teacher Education," which form the proposed core of professional knowledge needed by professional teachers who will practice in the world of tomorrow. The resource materials are to be used by teacher educators to reexamine and enhance their current practice in preparing classroom teachers to work competently and comfortably with children who have a wide range of individual needs. Each module provides further elaboration of a specified "cluster of capabilities" - in this case, teacher relations with minority students and their families.

Contents

Within this module are the following components:

Page

Set of Objectives - The objectives focus on the teacher educator rather than as a student (preservice teacher). They identify what can be expected as a result of working through the materials. The objectives which apply to teachers are also identified. They are statements about skills, knowledge, and attitudes which should be part of the "common body of practice" of all teachers. 1

Rating Scale - Scale is included by which a teacher educator could, in a cursory way, assess the degree to which the knowledge and practices identified in this module are prevalent in the existing teacher-training program. The rating scale also provides a catalyst for further thinking in each area. 3

Self-Assessment - Specific test items were developed to determine a user's working knowledge of the major concepts and principles in each subtopic. The self-assessment may be used as a pre-assessment to determine whether one would find it worthwhile to go through the module or as a self check, after the materials have been worked through. The self-assessment items also can serve as examples of mastery test questions for students. 4

Rationale and Knowledge Base - The body of the module summarizes the knowledge base and empirical support for the selected topics on psychological education. The more salient concepts and strategies are reviewed. This section includes:

	Page
Stereotypes and Expectations	10
Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Stereotyping	10
Basic Concepts	10
Characteristics of Minority Children and their Families	13
Family Characteristics	14
Cognitive Style and Sense Modality Preferences	17
Motivation	21
Summary	23
Teacher Expectations and Student Performance	24
Teacher Expectations and Culturally Different Children	25
Learned Helplessness	30
Overcoming Helplessness	34
Summary	37
Activities for Teacher Education	43
Concept: Discrepancies in Role Expectations	43
Concept: Sociocultural Variations in Motivation	47
Concepts: Family Characteristics, Learned helplessness and Alienation	50
Concepts: Attention, Task Persistence, Learned Helplessness	54

Resources - Following the list of references is a partial bibliography of important books and articles, activities, organizations, and tapes related to the topic. 57

Appendix A - Key to Self-Assessment 69

Appendix B - Responses to Exercises 73

Articles - Three brief articles accompany the aforementioned components. The articles support and expand on the knowledge base. 78

Objectives

Upon completion of this module you will be better able:

1. To recognize or apply the following concepts, as evidenced by responses to multiple choice items, or by appropriate use of the concepts in written responses and group discussion:

   a. culture
   b. society
   c. social status
   d. social role
   e. ascribed and assigned status/role
   f. nuclear family
   g. extended family
   h. matriarchial family
   i. patriarchial family
   j. cognitive style
   k. field dependence
   l. field independence
   m. stereotype
   n. locus of control
   o. learned helplessness

2. To use information concerning the sociocultural characteristics of children and families as the basis for alternative possible explanations of problems of learning and adjustment.

3. To describe inconsistencies in social science descriptions of the cultures of minority groups, and to identify the influence of uncritical acceptance of these descriptions on the formation of group stereotypes.

4. To test assumptions concerning the cultural characteristics of minority children through discussion with parents and other community members.

5. To describe the relationship between teacher expectancies and differential student-teacher interaction patterns.

6. To describe cultural, motivational, and cognitive characteristics attributed to minority groups, and to identify the limitations of social science generalizations about these characteristics.

7. To describe the relationship between locus of control and learned helplessness.

8. To identify instructional circumstances that are likely to lead to learned helplessness.

9. To list and describe procedures which the research literature suggests may be effective in the alleviation of learned helplessness.

Reasonable Objectives for Teacher Education

Upon completion of a teacher education program, teachers should:

1. Be familiar with major sociological and psychological research and concepts relating ethnic, cultural and social status with academic achievement and social behavior.
2. Be aware of the relationship between teacher expectancies and student achievement and sensitive to personal biases regarding minority students and their families.
3. Be knowledgeable and critical consumers of social science research regarding ethnic, cultural and social status, with particular sensitivity to potential stereotypical effects of such research.
4. Be skillful in resolving differences in role expectations of teachers and parents, and in reaching a consensus concerning shared goals.

Rating Scale for the Teacher Preparation Program

Check the statement that best describes the content of your teacher education related to working with minority students and their families.

____ 1. Students are provided no training or experience in working with students of ethnic or cultural backgrounds other than their own.

____ 2. Students are provided a cursory education on how and why some types of social and academic differences among students may be related to ethnic or minority group membership.

____ 3. Students are given a thorough education in how and why social and academic differences among students may be related to ethnic or minority group membership, but are also sensitized to the problems inherent in stereotypical distinctions.

____ 4. Students are knowledgeable of how and why ethnic or minority group membership may be related to differing patterns of academic and social behavior, and how ethnic and minority group membership may be an important variable to consider in planning instruction, but are critical consumers of generalizations about all people.

____ 5. Students are knowledgeable and practiced in working with students with diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds and their parents; they are informed about the influences of culture and subculture on students, but equally sensitive to how this "information" can create unfounded expectations for students.

Self Assessment

The following items are provided to enable you to test your existing knowledge of information and concepts. Answers are provided in Appendix A - Key to Self-Assessment.

1. The term culture refers to

   a. literature, the fine arts, and other higher forms of human creativity and expression.

   b. all of the beliefs and behaviors, including the products of behaviors, that members of a group learn and pass on from generation to generation.

   c. the institutions, such as law and religion, through which the interpersonal relationships of members of a society are organized.

   d. the uniquely human capabilities that are universally shared among homo sapiens.

2. Among American social scientists the term society refers to

   a. the aggregation of people who share a common set of institutions.

   b. the customary behaviors and institutions shared by a specifiable population.

   c. patterns of conduct which govern interpersonal relationships in a human population.

   d. the segment of people in a community who control the major portion of power and resources.

3. An ascribed status is

   a. an earned position within a social system.

   b. the behavior one is expected to display by virtue of attained position.

   c. a position assigned within a social system on the basis of nonmodifiable attributes.

   d. the behavior one is expected to display by virtue of assigned responsibilities within a social system.

4. From a social system perspective, mental retardation and emotional disturbance are considered as

   a. achieved social statuses.

   b. ascribed social statuses.

   c. achieved social roles.

   d. acquired social roles.

5. Which of the following terms does not fit with the other three?

   a. locus of control

   b. experimental control

   c. internal control

   d. external control

6. Evaluate the assumption that the single parent, matriarchical family that is predominant among American blacks is historically derived from conditions of slavery, in which family groups were broken up and children were reared in mother-headed household.

7. Describe the typical family form among Mexican-Americans and contrast this structure with the modal Anglo-American family.

8. Children in some cultural groups are socialized to be more influenced by affiliation motives than by achievement motives. Describe the educational implications of such socialization.

9. How does the theme of fatalism in Latin American cultures influence the performance of school children from these groups?

10. Describe how the authoritarian, patriarchial structure of Mexican-American families influences the academic motivation of their children.

11. Differentiation theory suggests that socialization practices influence the development of the field dependence/field independence dimension of cognitive style. How do Anglo-American and Mexican-American children differ on this dimension, and what instructional adjustments have been recommended to provide for these differences?

12. Develop a brief scenario to depict how the reciprocal relationship among a minority student's behavior and capabilities and the environmental conditions in a classroom (including teacher behavior and tasks) might lead to a pattern of learned helplessness.

13. Describe the relationship between teacher expectancies and teacher-student interactions, and indicate how these patterns affect minority children.

14. Explain how the progressive increase in variability of school achievement of minority children may be accounted for. Use the concepts of precursor skills and discontinuities in behavioral norms in your response.

Teacher Relations with Minority Students

and their Families

Events since the mid-1960s have served to emphasize the pluralistic nature of American society, and to stress the need for educators to take the social and cultural characteristics of children into consideration as they plan and carry out instructional programs. The recognition of this need has persisted into the 1980s, albeit with diminished fervor, in spite of the many false starts, underfunded programs, faulty assumptions, and unfulfilled promises of the era of the great society, and in the face of new national priorities that appear to have less room for "the other Americans." Although funding has been cut for programs such as bilingual education, there is widespread acceptance among educators of a need to devise curricula, instructional methods, and pupil services in ways that will bring educational experiences into harmony with the cultural experiences of children from diverse backgrounds.

However, this goal is deceptively simple. Even the easy part, that which requires that the curriculum reflect content familiar to students from non middle-class, non-Anglo backgrounds, is rarely accomplished at a level beyond the introduction of holidays and national foods. The part that implies that educational processes should be governed by considerations that take cultural background into account has been even slower to develop. The difficulty arises from the fact that little is known about the interrelationships between culturally determined student characteristics and instructional processes. In fact, there is considerable controversy concerning just what characteristics constitute the cultures of the various minority

groups served by the schools in the United States. Thus, a number of perplexing questions and issues dot the boundaries between ethnic cultures and American schools.

It would be useful for teachers to have access to complete ethnographic descriptions of the populations with which they work in order to sensitize them to possible cultural explanations for the behaviors and learning problems they encounter. Such a set of descriptions is well beyond the scope of this set of materials. In many cases accurate descriptions are not accessible from any single source. The alternative of listing characteristics out of context would be counterproductive. We have already witnessed the outcomes of that approach. During the 1960s anthropologists and sociologists were called upon to provide descriptions that would help teachers to understand their charges. The characterizations teachers learned were often even more stereotyped than the conceptions they previously held. For example, they were taught that Mexican-Americans have difficulty making it in an Anglo world because they operated with a present-time orientation (Kluckhohn & Strodbeck, 1961), or that people of meager means in a wide variety of locations suffer from the effects of being socialized in a "culture of poverty," (Lewis, 1961, 1966). The culture of poverty was purported to interfere with achievement strivings because people from such backgrounds were motivated to seek immediate gratification of their needs, rather than deferring their needs for more significant returns at a future point in time as, it was assumed, middle class people do. This is not to say that the ethnic minorities in the schools do not have distinctive subcultures, but rather that glib assumptions about cultural characteristics may lead to damaging stereotyping.

The approach taken in this module is to explore how stereotyped conceptions of minority children and their families may influence the expectations of educators. We then examine how these expectations interact with children's approaches to academic tasks in ways that may produce student perceptions and behaviors which are either adaptive or maladaptive in instructional and assessment settings. Child behaviors which seem to violate the norms for classroom culture are particularly relevant to the identification of discontinuities between home and classroom cultures.

Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Stereotyping

Basic Concepts

> **Exercise 1**
>
> Before you read this section, list the items educators most often use to describe the characteristics of children from two minority groups with which you are familiar. Identify the similarities and differences in characteristics enumerated in the two lists. How do these characteristics differ from a list that would describe majority groups' children? Which characteristics in each list cluster together in a meaningful pattern that could be justified as aspects of an ethnic culture?
>
> Compare your responses to the items above with responses of members and non-members of the groups you have identified. How do you account for similarities and differences in your conclusions?

A common understanding of fundamental sociocultural concepts is essential to a shared understanding of the ideas and information explored in this module. Therefore, a brief review of sociocultural concepts is in order before we turn to an examination of ways in which ethnic stereotypes may influence teacher behaviors and student responses.

Often the term "culture" is used glibly to characterize and explain behavior, but the concept is extremely abstract. Those who have attempted to operationalize it for purposes of crosscultural psychological research (e.g., Holtzman, Diaz-Guerrero, & Swartz, 1975) have found what a challenging task that is. Numerous definitions have been offered for the concept of culture (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952), but they have in common the idea that culture is composed of habitual patterns of behavior that are characteristic of a group of people. Those shared behavioral patterns are transmitted from

one generation to the next through symbolic communication (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952).

With their traditional emphasis on symbolic communication as the means by which customary behavior is transmitted, most anthropolog cal definitions have overlooked the important process of modeling and observational learning as a major means by which neophytes acquire their culture.

Cultures can be described at varying levels of inclusiveness. Thus we may speak of the culture of an ethnic group, or within socioeconomic strata certain patterns of behaviors, values and preferences may be shared. But subcultures are part of a larger whole (Laosa, 1981), and behavior within groups may vary more than behavior between groups (Henderson, 1982).

Among American anthropologists, the term society refers to the aggregate of people who live together in an organized population. The focus of the construct "society" is on the people, while culture focuses on the behaviors and traditions they share.

The members of each culture or subculture hold behavioral expectations for a number of different statuses in the social order. These expectations define the roles people play as participants in the society. A status is the name of a particular social position (e.g., school principal), while the role is defined by a shared understanding concerning the behaviors that are appropriate for that position.

Some statuses are ascribed. One does not "earn" them by demonstration of specific behaviors, skills, or credentials. The status of child is ascribed. Other statuses are acquired, such as that of school psychologist. Jane Mercer (1973) argues that certain statuses which are often regarded as personal characteristics are actually acquired statuses. In Mercer's view,

mentally retarded is, at least in part, one such status. Once an individual is assigned a status, socialization agents employ a variety of social influence procedures that are consistent with the role definitions and expectations for that status.

Roles do not exist in isolation. They are defined by mutual expectations operating between pairs of roles, such as parent-child, teacher-child, or parent-teacher. In order for role relationships to be transacted smoothly, the expectations must be shared. Some of the problems that teachers and students or teachers and parents have with each other may stem from differential role expectations, especially in the case of families from sub-cultural or socioeconomic groups that do not completely share the middle-class norms that govern school practices (Parra & Henderson, 1982; Winetsky, 1978).

Exercise 2

In what way may "mental retardation" be considered an achieved status? What implications does this view hold for teachers in regular classrooms?

Achieved statuses are earned by meeting culturally defined criteria. The status of teacher, and the accompanying role, is achieved. Through effort and ability a child may achieve the status of little league pitcher, or eagle scout. Mercer (1970) believes that mental retardation is also an achieved status. The individual's behavior is labeled (status designation) on the basis of behavior that deviates from the norms of a given social

context (the classroom), but the label then comes to be viewed as characteristics of the individual. The person is then expected to behave in accordance with the achieved role, and others (teachers) behave toward the person in accordance with a set of shared role expectations.

In well-defined, relatively homogeneous groups, ethnographers have described the distinctive patterns of belief, behavior, and products that comprise those particular cultures. Under such circumstances social structures can be analyzed and the status-role relationships identified rather comprehensively. But the groups being served by the schools in the United States are not homogeneous and they do not display an unambiguous cultural configuration for those who must plan instructional programs and services. While there are patterns of behavior that constitute somewhat distinctive subcultures within the United States, two points bear consideration. First, there is an extensive range of behavior within any United States subculture (Blackwell, 1975; Henderson & Merritt, 1968; Laosa, 1979). Given the behavioral heterogeneity of ethnic and racial groups, it is important to consider both the diversity and the similarities to be found within any particular group. When diversity is ignored, stereotyping is the inevitable result. Additionally, the quality of social science research on minority group cultures has recently been called into question (see Staples & Mirandé, 1980). Specific criticisms by revisionist historians and minority group social scientists are considered in association with specific issues in the following section.

Characteristics of Minority Children and their Families

What are the distinctive cultural characteristics of the minority children and their families to whom educational and therapeutic processes

should be responsive? There is no dearth of literature describing the family life and other cultural attributes of the various minority groups to whom the schools have a responsibility, but the conclusions are far from unambiguous. A sample of the issues raised by this research is presented here as a source of hypotheses for explaining instructional problems involving minority children, and to caution against unqualified generalizations.

Family Characteristics

> Exercise 3
>
> Educators often postulate that problems for which children are referred to school psychologists are the result of family influences. This is particularly true for minority children. Identify some of the ways in which family characteristics are thought to influence children's problems in school learning and adjustment. Then suggest alternative hypotheses to explain these problems. Test your assumptions in discussions with parents from the target community.

Children's academic excellence and their academic problems as well are attributed to characteristics of the family unit. The fact that a high proportion of gifted children are from Jewish and Oriental families is thought to result from the high positive value afforded intellectual activities and the role of scholar in both of these cultures (Kirk & Gallagher, 1979). On the other hand, family characteristics have been blamed for the educational failures that plague disproportionate numbers of children from hispanic and black backgrounds.

For example, the black family has been characterized as unstable and matriarchial (Moynihan, 1967). Unfavorable comparisons of black families with the nuclear form that is assumed to be normative for white middle-class

Americans have been consistent with a sociological assumption that the nuclear family, with its division of labor, is the family form best suited to meet the demands of modern industrialized societies (c.f., Parsons, 1949).

Many social scientists assume that the mother-centered family represents the continuation of a pattern established during slavery (Pettigrew, 1964). Revisionist scholars have begun to call these conclusions into question, offering long neglected data to support their alternative interpretations. English (1974) reviewed a number of studies which suggested that even during the hardships of slavery, many black slaves were able to develop stable, two parent families. Black households in both southern and northern cities during the late 1800s were predominantly two parent families.

In brief, social science statements about black families and their history have sometimes overgeneralized from small, unrepresentative samples. Often they have perpetuated old assumptions without studying black families directly. Recent evidence from documents such as census records suggests that unstable families headed by females have not been the rule during the history of the black family in the United States. New works have attempted to identify positive aspects of black families. It should be noted that only about one third of American black families conform to the stereotyped matriarchial single parent form (English, 1974). Even for those that do seem to fit the stereotype, the entire social and political matrix of life for black people must be analyzed to understand the forces that shape their lives. The stereotyped description of a single parent, matricentric family, is likely to be more misleading than instructive for those educators who are called upon to help structure a more favorable educational opportunity for a black child.

Something akin to a pathology model has also been employed to describe Mexican-American and other minority families. But unlike the stereotyped black family which is characterized as matriarchal and unstable, the Chicano or Mexican-American family is depicted in the social science literature as a stable, patriarchal, extended unit (Montiel, 1973). Within the home the husband is depicted as an authority figure who demands and receives unquestioning obedience from his wife and children. His supremacy in the home is seen as a compensation for his second-class citizenship in the outside world. He makes all the financial decisions, disciplines the children, and represents the family in dealings with the community. The wife is expected to be chaste and unworldly. She puts her husband's desires before her own. This pattern is so widely accepted as the norm for the Mexican family that the Spanish word machismo has become the standard term for designating male dominance in the American language (Hawkes & Taylor, 1975).

It is assumed that this form of family structure, with minor modifications, is the dominant form among Americans of Mexican heritage, but there is a substantial body of empirical data that fails to support that generalization. Deviations from these presumed norms are usually attributed to acculturation, or to the increasing financial independence of women, but there is evidence to suggest that the patriarchal pattern may never have been the norm (Griffith, 1948; Woods, 1956; Grebler, Moore, & Guzman, 1970, cited in Hawkes & Taylor, 1975). Moreover, data from the 1930s suggest that the Mexican-American family in the United States was anything but stable at that time, and data based on Chicano families in Los Angeles, California, and San Antonio, Texas, indicate that a very small percentage of families were of the extended type. In fact, the extended family may never have been as prevalent among Mexican-Americans as social scientists have suggested

(Montiel, 1973). As for the authoritarian, patriarchal stereotype, Hawkes and Taylor (1975) investigated the prevalence of male dominance among Mexican-American farm labor families and found that, by a wide margin, the most prevalent mode of decision-making and action was egalitarian.

The knowledge that common assumptions about the nature of the Chicano family are faulty should call into question a number of Social Science assertions that purport to explain how Mexican-American families damage their children's ability to do well in school. Paternal authoritarianism, strong family ties, and a present-time orientation are presented as antithetical to traits such as achievement, independence, and deferred gratification. These traits are considered essential to mobility. The sharply defined division of labor assumed to function in the Mexican family is also seen as detrimental to mobility and advancement in an industrial society (Heller, 1966). A curious reasoning in all of this may be noted by remembering that for the black family, exactly opposite traits (e.g., maternal authority, weak family ties, lack of a sharp dividion of labor) are held responsible for the educational difficulties of children and youth.

2. Cognitive Style and Sense Modality Preferences

Exercise 4

Before you read this section, jot down your answers to the following questions. When you have finished the section, go over your responses and see if you have changed any of your original ideas. For each question, give the justification for your answer.

- Is cognitive style a sociocultural characteristic that influences children's responses to instruction?
- Is cognitive style affected by differences in the socialization practices of parents from different subcultures?
- Should cognitive style or modality preferences influence the design of instruction?
- Can cognitive style and modality preferences be diagnosed?
- Can instructional prescriptions be generated on the basis of information on children's modality preferences or cognitive styles?

Socialization practices are among the behavior patterns which may differ across ethnic groups, and it would be surprising if variations in child rearing practices were not associated with cognitive and behavioral differences among children from diverse backgrounds. Some social scientists argue that, as a result of different socialization experiences, children develop different cognitive styles, or preferences for one sense modality over another. Since cognitive styles and modality preferences are assumed to influence how people view reality, it is suggested that there should be an optimum match between the children's cognitive styles and the instructional styles of their teachers. People who are visually oriented are said to focus on objects while those whose orientation is predominantly oral-aural are predisposed toward a more personalized involvement with the world around them. These preferences are assumed to be associated with literacy traditions, on the one hand, and with oral-aural traditions on the other. From this perspective it is argued that the high rate of school failure among children from minority subcultures may be due to the fact that the school curriculum and methods are more congruent with the literacy tradition of middle-class families than with the preferences of people whose socialization was imbedded in a more oral-aural tradition (Lewis, nd).

The field dependence/field independence (FDI) dimension has also been postulated as an influence on the school achievement of minority children. It is asserted that children who are socialized in settings where conformance to authority is emphasized tend toward the field dependent end of the dimension while those with more egalitarian upbringing are more field independent. From the previous discussion you can see that Mexican-Americans, for example, are assumed to have experienced more authoritarian relationships with parents than non-Hispanic white children. Presumably, field independent people

are better at solving problems which require that some important element be removed from the context in which it is presented. Presumably they also have a more fully developed sense of individual identity than field independent people, and are freer from various forms of social influence. Thus, those who are field independent should be better able than their field dependent counterparts to analyze things apart from their context, and to view their own functioning apart from the group. Field independent people are thought to have more complex cognitive systems--that is, they are more differentiated (Kagan and Buriel, 1977). Increasing differentiation of structure and function is the hallmark of developmental progress in most theories of development (e.g., Piaget, Freud, Lewin).

Some researchers interpret existing FDI research to show that field dependent people have better social and interpersonal skills than those who are field independent. On the other hand, field independent people do better on tasks that require cognitive restructuring (Laosa & DeAvila, 1979; Witkin & Goodenough, 1977; Witkin, Goodenough & Oltman, 1977).

Some researchers believe that neither style has an absolute advantage over another. They assent that each pole of the dimension has an adaptive value for given tasks and situations (Laosa, in press). This, however, has not been the dominant view, since most developmentalists assume that increased differentiation is the basis for enhanced ability to deal with cognitive complexity. Thus the designation of a given group as field dependent is implicitly pejorative.

While there is a fair amount of evidence that Mexican-American children tend to score more field dependent than Anglo children on certain tasks, the research has not clearly established that this pattern results from authoritarian socialization. Neither has it been clearly demonstrated that there

is a causal relationship between a field dependent cognitive style and interpersonal skills.

What are the educational implications of the claim that Mexican-American children are more field dependent than Anglo-American children?

On the one hand it has been advocated that schools should train children to be more field independent because this style is more compatible with the analytic requirements of school tasks than the field dependent cognitive style (Witkin, 1967). Meanwhile, other voices (Ramirez, 1973) have argued the need for a better match between the cognitive styles of students and teachers. One study (Sanders and Scholz, 1976) which examined the hypothesis that field dependent and Mexican-American children would make better academic progress when paired with teachers with a matching cognitive style found, contrary to expectations, that field dependent children with field independent teachers gained more than those with field dependent teachers.

Ramirez and Castaneda (1974) have expanded on the FDI concepts, renaming the field dependent construct as field sensitive, a less pejorative term. They maintain that both styles must be represented in the classroom in order for education to be culturally democratic. Long term positive effects in mathematics and reading scores have been reported for a program based on the systematic elaboration of these basic assumptions (Kagan and Buriel, 1977), but results have not yet been fully published or replicated. Some additional support for the notion that consideration of children's cognitive style may enhance educational outcomes is provided in a recent study by Doebler and Eicke (1979).

Thus, evidence on the socialization antecedents of cognitive styles is mixed, and the outcomes of attempts to take cognitive style into consideration

in instructional practices are still inconclusive. It would be inappropriate to encourage educators to adopt stereotyped expectations that children from a particular background will have difficulty with certain kinds of school tasks because of a particular cognitive style that has been associated with group membership. On the other hand, when children have difficulty responding to particular kinds of academic expectations, it would be appropriate to explore the hypothesis that the difficulty may be mediated by a cognitive style that is discrepant from the requirements of the task.

3. Motivation

a) Achievement and Affiliation Motives

> Exercise 5
>
> Assume that a colleague asks you for tips on organizing a more effective instructional program for children who are more motivated by affiliation need than by achievement need. What suggestions could you offer?

Motivation is too broad and complex a topic to be treated in detail here. Just two selected issues will be mentioned to illustrate the misleading nature of assumptions that are often made about the academic motivation of minority children.

The first assumption is that children must be activated by achievement motivation if they are to do well in school. Achievement motivation requires that the learner be guided by internal standards of excellence. Since some Hispanic and Pacific Island groups are thought to be motivated more by the need for affiliation than by the need for achievement, they are expected to do relatively poorly at schoolwork. Thus, for example, the affiliation motive reported as characteristic of Hawaiian children is assumed to account for their poor record of achievement. Since thay are assumed to give higher

priority to helping others, seeking good fellowship, or honoring a personal commitment than to seeking personal gain, it is reasoned that individual scholastic achievement must be sacrificed. Contrary to that expectation, a motivational pattern based on affiliation has proved not to be a negative factor in the school achievement of Hawaiians (Gallimore, 1974). Since these children tend to be responsive to peers and are likely to contribute effort to group goals, educators may be well advised to organize instructional activities to emphasize cooperative rather than competitive, norm-referenced learning (see Johnson & Johnson in this series). This suggestion should be treated as an hypothesis to be examined in practice with a given group of children rather than as a prescription. Given the variability that exists within identifiable groups, a cooperative predisposition or affiliation need should not be assumed. Nor should the efficacy of a given mode of structuring classroom goals be taken as a panacea.

b) Fatalism

> Exercise 6
>
> A colleague describes a Mexican-American child in her/his classroom to you as an "underachiever." She/he believes the child lacks motivation to do school work because "his people" have a fatalistic attitude that prevents them from exerting effort to overcome difficulties. Can you think of an alternative rival hypothesis to explain the "lack of effort" described by the teacher? Record your rival hypotheses and your rationale for them now. Then read the following section on fatalism and the information in section C on "Teacher Expectations and Classroom Interactions."
>
> Does this information change or confirm your hunches?

Educators have been taught that an attitude of fatalism hampers the educational, social and economic advancement of Mexican-Americans (Heller, 1966; Madsen, 1964; Paz, 1961). They have been led to believe that Mexican-

Americans, for example, view good or bad fortune as the work of fate. Fatalism, it is reasoned, leads to resignation, which Anglo observers interpret as lack of drive or determination. The writings of some social scientists (e.g., Heller, 1966; Madsen, 1964) have suggested that while Anglos try to overcome the misfortunes that befall them, Mexican-Americans accept it.

If this were true, it might well explain some patterns of behavior displayed by Hispanic children in school. But careful attention to available data suggests the generalization is overdrawn. One quantitative study (Farris and Glenn, 1976) found that when level of education was controlled, there were no differences between Anglos and Mexican-Americans on the dimension of fatalism. There may be more viable explanations than a generalized attitude of fatalism to explain why some Hispanic or other minority children may fail to respond to failure with increased levels of effort. These alternative hypotheses are explored in section C.

4. Summary

Within the population of children to be served by the schools there are numerous subcultural groups whose behavior differs in various ways from the norms of middle-class America. There are problems in identifying what behavior patterns are characteristic of the culture of a particular group, because the patterns in question often covary with other factors such as socioeconomic status or rural vs. urban life style.

While it is important to understand the cultural background of the children we work with, blanket descriptions are sometimes more harmful than helpful because the social science research base for the cultural description of ethnic groups is suspect in several regards. The foregoing issues were reviewed to illustrate the cause for cautious interpretation.

Many descriptions involve the acceptance of dated assumptions, without the benefit of first-hand study of the communities in question. Any particular behavior is likely to have meaning only in the context of a total pattern of customary behavior, and fragmented postulates, taken out of context, often lead to stereotyped expectancies. This is not to say that useful descriptions are not available. But much of the existing literature is adequate only to suggest hypotheses. When black children speak out during a teacher's presentation rather than remaining silent, or politely raising their hands for recognition, an educator familiar with the culture of the black community might consider this response an indication of interest rather than disrespect. Similarly, if a child avoids eye contact with adults, looking down when spoken to by a teacher, a teacher of Anglo-American background is likely to interpret the child's behavior as an indication of sneakiness. If the child is a Papago native-American, a teacher familiar with the culture should recognize the behavior as a way of showing respect for elders.

C. Teacher Expectations and Classroom Interactions

When children first come to school they vary substantially in their personal characteristics and capabilities. Besides this individual variation, the normative behavior displayed by groups of children from diverse cultural backgrounds may differ from the norms of traditional school culture. The black child speaking out in class, or the Papago child avoiding eye contact with teachers, mentioned above, are examples of deviations from the role behaviors teachers are likely to expect of students.

Differences between the classroom cultural norms of teachers and the cultural norms of children from certain ethnic subcultures or lower socioeconomic status are likely to result in conflict or in differential treatment of children, depending on how closely their behavior approximates the

norms of school culture. Proponents of an ecological perspective suggest that prohibitions having little to do with actual instructional effectiveness often become the source of difficulty between the culture bearer (educator) and culture violators (certain students) (Rhodes, 1967). Furthermore there is evidence that teachers tend to hold lower expectations of academic success for students who violate school norms through expressions of disinterest or inattention, as compared with students from the middle class majority culture. These expectations often find expression in teacher/student interactions.

1. Teacher Expectations and Culturally Different Children

Several years ago Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) created a stir within educational circles with a book bearing the intriguing title, Pygmalion in the Classroom. These investigators examined the self-fulfilling prophesy hypothesis which posits that teachers adjust their instructional efforts on the basis of their beliefs about the ability of individual children, and that the children's learning then conforms to the original expectation. Rosenthal and Jacobsen attempted to alter teacher expectancies experimentally by providing false information that certain children had been identified as having hidden potential. The investigators reported increases in the intelligence test performance of the falsely identified high potential children, but the study was so badly flawed that no such conclusions could be justifiably drawn (Elashoff and Snow, 1971). The results of subsequent research on the self-fulfilling prophesy has yielded very inconsistent results. Yet Rosenthal and Jacobsen's report was readily accepted by many educators and civil rights activists because it offered an attractive alternative to existing explanations of school failure that placed the blame on minority children themselves, their families, and their genetic inheritance. Others dismissed the entire hypothesis as implausible.

It is undoubtedly naive to assume, as Rosenthal and Jacobsen did, that the simple manipulation of information provided to teachers could produce a speedy influence on so general a measure as IQ. On the other hand, there is good reason to believe that reciprocal influences in the classroom may produce cumulative failure and "behavior problems" among many culturally diverse children. The brief review that follows provides evidence that teachers do form differential expectations regarding the achievement and behavior of the children they teach, and that those expectations influence their interactions with students. It also explores the question of what variables influence teacher expectations, and how children's learning is affected.

Exercise 7

Before you read the next section reflect on your conversations with other educators, discussions in the teachers lounge, and other situations in which educators discuss the behavior and performance of students. List the categories of student characteristics you think serve as determinants of teacher expectations.

A substantial body of research (Adams, 1978; Brophy & Good, 1974; Cooper, 1979, Laosa, 1978; Lockheed, 1977) shows that teacher expectations are associated with children's personal characteristics such as sex, social class, race, language and ethnicity. These expectations are apparently based on stereotyped conceptions of various groups. Even physical attractiveness influences expectations (Adams, 1978), leading teachers to judge unattractive children to be less intelligent, to show poorer academic promise, and to be less well-behaved in the classroom than attractive children. Since judgments of attractiveness are determined by cultural standards, black children who display striking negroid physical characteristics may be subject to especially negative expectations. Not only do teachers tend to judge unattractive children

to have less potential than attractive children for academic and social development, but they also appear more willing to recommend them for special class placement (Ross & Salvia, 1975).

While some researchers assume that teacher expectations influence achievement, others argue that just the reverse is true: that is, the student ahcievement determines teacher expectancies (Dusek & O'Connell, 1973; Dusek & Wheeler, 1974; Williams, 1972). Other evidence suggests that differential teacher expectations and behaviors are not influenced by their perceptions of student ability or achievement per se. Rather, teachers may be responding to student behaviors that are interpreted as evidences of their academic motivation or lack of it. Luce and Hoge (1978) found that when fourth grade teachers interacted with students whom they judged to have low motivation to do school work they were more procedural, more critical, and gave more behavioral warnings than when they worked with students who were ranked higher in motivation. The student behaviors that seemed to serve as stimuli for the formation of teacher expectancies were task initiation and attention. These behaviors are likely to be among the ones for which the behavior of many ethnic minority students may differ from the norms of the school culture. Experimental research shows that attending and non-attending behavior do have a marked effect on teacher behavior (Klein, 1971).

Willis and Brophy's (1974) work provides further insights into the ways in which the behaviors and attitudes of students and teachers may influence each other. These researchers found that pupils to whom teachers felt attachment were seen as successful and compliant. They responded in a way that teachers found rewarding. Teachers expressed concern for those students who had difficulty with schoolwork, but who were also compliant and who reenforced

their teachers in their interactions with them. Teachers responded by providing them with a good deal of remedial help.

Those students to whom teachers felt indifferent failed to respond in a way their teachers found rewarding. Their non-rewarding responses led to a pattern in which teachers spent little time with them, even though they perceived these students' need for additional help. These rejected students not only failed to provide teachers with rewarding interpersonal contacts, but they were also credited with the creation of discipline problems and classroom disturbances. Teachers wanted to get rid of these students, and they attributed low ability traits to them which did not accurately reflect demonstrated ability.

The investigations cited above provide several kinds of evidence that teacher expectancies and attitudes may be more influenced by the observed behaviors of students themselves than by personal characteristics associated with group membership. While such evidence suggests that teacher expectancies and attitudes may be more influenced by the observed behaviors of students themselves than by personal characteristics associated with group membership. While such evidence suggests that teacher expectancies may merely reflect previous experience with children displaying certain characteristics, it is instructive to note that teachers do tend to express stereotyped expectations based on labels assigned to children. This is true even when observable behavior displayed by the children so identified is incompatible with the categorical label (Foster & Ysseldyke, 1976; Gillung & Rucker, 1977). For example, Foster and Ysseldyke (1976) had teachers identify behaviors they expected to be displayed by hypothetical children labeled as emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, mentally retarded, and normal. As anticipated, the teachers held more negative expectancies toward the children categorized

with a deviance label than toward normal children. The teachers were then assigned to one of four groups. All groups viewed the same video tape of a normal fourth grade boy engaged in a variety of test-taking activities and in free play. Each of the four groups was told the boy was a member of a different one of the categories mentioned above. After viewing the tape, negative expectancies were expressed toward the children categorized with one of the deviancy labels, even though the deviancy label groups had observed behavior inconsistent with the label. These results are relevant to our consideration of possible teacher expectancy influences on minority and poor children, because, traditionally, these children have been overrepresented among those to whom special category labels have been assigned.

Exercise 8

On the basis of your own experience, describe some of the ways in which you would expect instructional interactions to vary depending on differential teacher expectancies. Contrast teacher responses to high expectancy students with responses to low expectancy students.

Differential teacher responses toward different categories of children have been well documented (Good & Brophy, 1974). While it is clear that they may be reacting to differences in the achievement and motivational behaviors of children, the issue may be more complicated than that. For example, one study of interactions between a white teacher and a small group of black and white nursery school girls suggested that a lack of shared understanding of expectations and gestural meanings between a white teacher and black children could account for differences in children's success in gaining the teacher's attention (Byers, 1972). However, merely providing children with teachers of matching ethnicity, which might seem

the simple solution to this problem, is not apparently sufficient to change unequal treatment in the classroom (Bvalick & Bersoff, 1974).

Thus, the research suggests that children from cultural backgrounds that diverge from school norms are more likely than their peers to display characteristics that elicit negative expectations and patterns of teacher response that are more designed to manage behavior than to provide skill and content relevant instruction. While teacher expectations may be based, in part, on group stereotypes, educators may also be responding to behaviors that deviate from the implicit norms that are reinforced in classrooms. As a function of apparent lower initial achievement and motivation, reinforced by stereotyped expectations based on factors such as race, ethnicity, physical appearance or socioeconomic status, minority children stand a chance of receiving fewer skill and content-related communications from their teachers, resulting in poorer achievement, less task involvement, and diminished effort.

Bear in mind, however, that minority children are not homogeneous. They differ in their initial achievement behaviors, and in the degree to which their behavior conforms to the norms of the school culture. Thus, an initial discontinuity between some children's entering repertoires of behavior may lead to initial failure, lack of support, and the beginning of a series of reciprocal influences that result in cumulative discrepancies from the achievement and behavioral expectations of the schools. Children who fall into this pattern may come to feel helpless to influence their own lives within the academic context (Henderson, 1980, 1982).

2. Learned Helplessness

Some individuals perceive themselves to be incapable of overcoming failure. They learn to feel helpless through experiences in situations in

which they have no control over aversive events. The concept of "learned helplessness" has a common sense appeal to educators and psychologists who find that it provides insight into the debilitating behavior they observe among school children who otherwise seem quite capable. The relevance of the learned helplessness concept to classroom settings seems obvious in those studies in which individuals have been taught to perceive themselves as helpless through feedback convincing them that problems they have failed in an experimental setting measure important intellectual abilities.

The learned helplessness phenomena has much in common with the idea of locus of control. According to the locus of control construct, individuals whose behavior is influenced by internal control believe they have a substantial personal influence on things that happen to them. They are likely to perceive events that befall them as the result of their own ability or effort. Others fail to perceive a link between their own effort and reinforcement. They are likely to perceive events as the result of luck or misfortune. They perceive the cause of events as external.

Some children seem to learn quickly, through their school experience, that they are destined to do poorly compared to their classmates. They see no way for it to be otherwise. A disproportionate number of these children, those who develop external locus of control perceptions for achievement situations, appear to come from minority or lower socioeconomic status backgrounds.

Exercise 9

List some of the cultural characteristics of groups you work with which may make them susceptible to learning to feel that they are unable to cope with school tasks. Describe the responses of these children to academic tasks. What are the implications for teaching?

Both locus of control and learned helplessness exist along a continuum. Designations such as "helpless" or "external" are merely used as a convenience in referring to individuals whose responses tend to fall toward one pole or the other. Children who are categorized as helpless tend to attribute their failures to lack of ability rather than to the level of their own effort (Diener & Dweck, 1978; Dweck, 1975; Dweck & Busch, 1976; Dweck & Rappucci, 1973). Even when helpless children are initially competent at a given task, they subsequently display maladaptive responses once they have experienced failure at that task. Children who have learned to feel helpless in the face of difficulties tend to attribute their failure to personal inability,and their performance on subsequent tasks is impaired. In contrast, non-helpless children are likely to attribute lack of success to insufficient effort on their own part, and they display no deterioration in performance following the failure experience. In fact, Diener and Dweck (1978) found that the performance of children who attribute failure to lack of effort often shows improvement following failure, apparently due to increased effort.

Dweck's (1975) research on learned helplessness has clear educational implications. Since helpless children evidence little recognition of effort as a determinant of success or failure, in comparison with children who persevere even after failure, they fail to see their own responsibility for outcomes. They are thus likely to see aversive situations as insurmountable. Thus, following an unsuccessful effort they may fail to respond to subsequent tasks of the same sort by trying harder or by sticking to the task longer. Dweck has emphasized that an aversive event, in this case failure on an intellectual task, is not in itself the cause of the helplessness phenomenon. The critical difference between helpless and persevering children appears to lie in their

perception of the relationship between their own behavior and the failure outcome.

Histories of failure or success appear to play a major role in the development of internality-externality (Kifer, 1975; Weisz, 1979), and the more specific attributions of cause (e.g., effort vs. ability, task difficulty, or luck) which influence future expectations and task oriented behavior. The nature of schooling in the United States is such that certain children may be predestined to experience heavy and repeated doses of failure from the first grade on. A disproportionate number of poor and minority children whose outside-of-school socialization is not highly congruent with the curricular expectations of middle class oriented schools are likely to fall within this group.

Thomas (1979) has called attention to striking parallels between the features of the learned helplessness syndrome and the characteristics of children classified as learning disabled. While the term learning disabilities refers to such a hodge-podge of symptoms it is virtually impossible to identify common characteristics of the children to whom the label is applied (Lilly, 1979), one common element seems to be an overlay of frustration and defeat. Learning disabled children are often portrayed as being convinced that they cannot learn, and much of the initial teaching effort with them is directed to motivating them to expand sufficient effort to achieve success (Thomas, 1979). Typically these children are easily frustrated, low in effort and persistence, and they may be unwilling to attempt even those tasks that are within the range of their ability. Their learning histories are often dominated by failure. The more consistent the history of failure is, the more likely it is that failure will be attributed to ability or lack of it (Frieze & Weiner, 1971 cited in Thomas, 1979.

3. Overcoming Helplessness

> Exercise 10
>
> List procedures that you think teachers could use to help children to overcome feelings of helplessness.

The provision of purposes for learning has been identified as an important mediator of the relationship between locus of control, motivation and performance. There is also evidence that the effects of purpose may vary depending on whether learning objectives are set by a teacher or by the students themselves. Arlin and Whitley (1978) tested the hypothesis that students would be more likely to accept personal responsibility for success or failure when they perceive a role in determining their own activities. These investigators anticipated that the perceptions of academic control and opportunities for self-management would have an interactive influence on each other. The findings suggested that students who have been encouraged to manage their own learning were more likely than their peers from traditional classrooms to develop willingness to accept personal responsibility for their academic successes and failures. The results also suggested that opportunities for self-management may have more influence on perceptions of responsibility for failure than on perceptions of responsibility for success. The reason may be that in either type of classroom situation it may be easier for students to attribute success to themselves than failure, but rationalizations for failure may differ for the two types of classroom situations examined. When teachers determine the activities, students may interpret their failures as the result of bad luck, or the fault of the teacher. Students who have determined their own goals and activities may find it more difficult to pin responsibility for their failures on external sources.

It seems unlikely that the effects of success and failure operate independently of the social situation in which such experiences occur. Classrooms constitute the major social context in which social comparisons of performance are made routinely. These classrooms which employ a competitive goal structure are especially likely to encourage social comparisons (Ames, Ames & Felker, 1977; Henderson & Hennig, 1979).

With this in mind, Ames and her associates at Purdue set out to study how competitive and non-competitive classroom settings influence children's beliefs about the causes of success and failure for themselves and others. Their findings confirmed the expectation that the effects of success and failure experiences depend upon the nature of the social setting in which the attempted performance takes place. In this case children's attributions, their judgments of deservingness, and their satisfaction with the performance of self and others differed as a function of competitive and non-competitive reward structures. Competition leads to self-derogation. Compared to children who failed in non-competitive settings, those who failed under competitive conditions judged themselves to have less ability and to be less deserving of reward. They also experienced more negative affect than those who failed under non-competitive circumstances. Ames and her associates suggest that "The consequences of failure are obviously negative, but the impact of failure in competitive conditions seems to be rather devastating to a child's self-perceptions" (p. 7).

Dweck (1975) designed a study to determine whether helpless children's perceptions of the relationship between their behavior and failure outcomes could be altered with a form of attribution therapy. Beyond merely changing the perceptions of these children, Dweck was interested in determining if alteration in the failure attributions of helpless children would result in the reduction of maladaptive responses to failure. She compared the effects of

attribution retraining to a success-only procedure recommended by many behavior modifiers. Dweck anticipated that the success-only intervention would improve the ability of helpless children to sustain their efforts despite failure, because the treatment was expected to raise their expectations of success. Attribution retraining was expected to produce even greater improvement because it should provide a new interpretation for failure. Children subjected to this instruction would attribute failure to insufficient effort rather than to uncontrollable factors. Contrary to the investigator's expectation, consistent and sustained decreases in maladaptive reactions to failure were evidenced only by the Attribution Retraining group. While these children were able to confront failure in a more adaptive manner, some of the children in the Success Only condition displayed increased sensitivity to failure after an exclusive diet of success experiences. All of the subjects in the Attribution Retraining program showed increases in effort attributions, indicating that besides showing improved adaptation to failure in test situations, these children altered their attributions for failure with respect to mathematics in general.

The fact that subjects in the Success Only condition continued to display deterioration of performance following the intervention was interpreted by Dweck to suggest that the success-only procedures which many behaviorists advocate may be shortsighted. In her words:

> An instructional program for children who have difficulty dealing with failure would do well not to skirt the issue by trying to ensure success or by glossing over failure. Instead it should include procedures for dealing with this problem directly. (p. 684)

Other research (e.g., Andrews & Debus, 1978) supports the contention that attribution retraining is effective in changing children's attributions and their resistance to extinction.

4. Summary

The evidence shows quite clearly that teachers entertain differential expectations for the achievement of children who vary in personal characteristics which include cultural and racial dimensions such as ethnicity, language, and culturally determined standards of attractiveness. The amount and quality of instructional interactions often differ along the same dimensions. The question of whether teacher expectancies are based on these personal characteristics *per se* or on achievement characteristics that happen to covary with these characteristics has not been answered with complete satisfaction. Some careful methodological work suggests that achievement is the determining factor. Even if that is the case, the results are the same. If, for example, a relatively high proportion of poor and minority children enter school with achievement characteristics that elicit negative expectancies from their teachers, it makes little difference that the expectation was determined by achievement behavior rather than social class markers. The result is likely to be the same for the children involved.

The information reviewed in this section suggests that a path model may provide a partial explanation for the common pattern of school achievement in which minority and poor children tend to fall progressively further behind their peers as they move through school. That is, lack of precursor skills or lack of attention to instructional tasks may invite teacher responses that lead to failure and feelings of helplessness in the academic situation. This in turn may lead to reduced effort, as evidenced in poor attention and task persistence, which further influences low teacher expectations and associated instructional responses. Within subcultures there is a considerable range of variation in the degree to which the precursor

skills and behavioral norms and expectations learned at home are congruent with the norms and expectations that are explicit in the school culture. Thus, it is important to avoid stereotyped conceptions of the sociocultural characteristics of children from any given subculture, or from minority and lower socioeconomic backgrounds in general. Some evidence (Henderson, 1981; Laosa, 1981, in press b; Valencia, Henderson & Rankin, 1981) suggests that the most important factor in determining the congruence or incongruence between home and school socialization is the level of formal education attained by the mother.

While the behavior and achievements of children may change, evidence reviewed in this section indicated that, once formed, teachers' negative impressions of student ability based on stereotyped expectancies are resistant to change even when observable performance conflicts with expectations.

While some analyses suggest that achievement behavior is a major determinant of teacher expectancies, other work has demonstrated that differential teacher instructional behaviors may be more associated with judgments of student's motivation to do schoolwork than with estimates of ability or achievement in basic school subjects (Luce & Hoge, 1973). This finding is particularly interesting in connection with knowledge that teachers are influenced markedly by attending/non-attending behavior of students and with regard to what is known about how failure influences subsequent approaches to tasks by children with internal and external perceptions of causality. If helpless children respond to failure by declining to expend effort on subsequent trials, their own negative perceptions of their ability may be compounded by the use of more controlling, critical, externally determined influence on the part of the teacher.

Along similar lines, the work of Willis and Brophy (1974) suggests that teacher behavior toward children with similar achievement characteristics may vary as a function of student social behaviors, and especially by the degree to which interactions are experienced by teachers as rewarding. Under these circumstances, students whose behavior styles differ from the middle-class norms of the classroom are likely to experience proportionately fewer supportive and content-relative contacts from teachers. It would be no surprise if students from minority and poor family backgrounds were disproportionately represented among this group. The evidence suggests that discrimination of this sort is often unintentional, and that consultation which makes them aware of their differential interaction patterns might help some teachers to overcome the tendency represented in the findings summarized here (Good & Brophy, 1974).

The effects of failure on children's expectations and attribution of cause are meaningful only when considered in social context. It means little to be unsuccessful at a task that can be accomplished by only a few individuals. But to do poorly on tasks which are defined as normative social expectations is likely to impact on children's perceptions of their own ability. School tasks are widely regarded as normative social expectations, and under the competitive goal structures and the overt social comparisons that are implicit in norm referenced assessment practices, failure is likely to be particularly salient. Contrary to popular stereotype, minority parents do hold high aspirations for the academic accomplishments of their children, but actual expectations are often curtailed by contact with reality (Parra & Henderson, 1977). Children who experience failure in competitive settings are more likely than those who are unsuccessful in non-competitive settings to experience negative affect and to engage in self-

derogation. Thus, their future achievement strivings are likely to be discouraged. Competitive goal structures clearly highlight social comparisons and inhibit effort attributions.

Diminished effort is the natural consequence of attributions of outcome to inability. Children who learn to feel helpless in the face of difficulty attribute their difficulty to inability, which is detrimental to effort and persistence. Their responses are maladaptive and performance deteriorates. Non-helpless children, in contrast, tend to attribute failure to insufficient effort and their response is likely to be to exert more effort (Dweck, 1975). In fact, the critical difference between responses to failure by helpless and non-helpless, or mastery oriented children, may be that children in the latter group do not ordinarily make spontaneous causal attributions at all. Rather than seeking causes, they may pursue solutions through self-monitoring and self-instruction (Diener & Dweck, 1978).

A number of procedures designed to facilitate the adoption of internal attributions of cause, especially effort attributions, have been tested with encouraging results. Since failure experiences seem to play a particularly important role in the development of attributions to inability and external causes and in the learning of helplessness, the most simple solution might appear to be to provide externally oriented and helpless children with a rich diet of success. The facts do not appear to bear out that assumption. While failure may be instrumental in the learning of helplessness, the removal of failure does not appear to constitute a sufficient, or perhaps even constructive, condition to reverse the process. The finding that attribution retraining resulted in sustained decreases in maladaptive reactions to failure while a success only experience was ineffective, and, in fact, seemed to produce increased sensitivity to failure, should be instructive

for those who would attempt to help children develop feelings of efficacy within the context of schooling.

A variety of approaches, including attribution retraining, social reinforcement, and token systems in combination with social reinforcement have demonstrated promise for effecting such changes. The performance of externals seems to improve when clear purposes for tasks are communicated (Dollinger & Taub, 1977), and when children have a role in setting their own goals, they are likely to accept personal responsibility for success and failure to a greater degree than their peers whose goals are set for them by their teachers (Arlin & Whitley, 1978).

It should be cautioned that merely changing children's causal attributions of failure from external to internal, or from inability to effort, is not likely to produce sustained desirable results unless instruction is arranged to provide opportunities for successful outcomes from effort. In fact, to induce students to make effort attributions accompanied by effortful behavior is likely to have devastating results in the absence of opportunities for success. Hard work is a virtue of long standing in America, but Covington and Omelich (1979) have made a persuasive case that effort is a dougle-edged sword when it comes to school achievement. One of the few defenses a student facing academic difficulties may have available is to attempt to avoid the implication of inability by refusing to try. This assertion is supported by data (Covington & Omelich, 1979) showing that negative affect (shame) and attributions of inability were greater among college undergraduates following substantial effort than when they did little studying. These situations seem highly probable in cases where students are presented with tasks for which they lack precursor skills, and failure may begin to set in early because traditional instruction so rarely provides for

the careful identification and teaching of precursor skills and concepts that are required for the construction of behaviors that constitute instructional goals (Bandura, 1977; Bergan, 1977; Bergan & Parra, 1978; Bloom, 1976). Where such situations obtain, it is probably more adaptive for a child to attribute failure to external influences than to his/her own inability.

Activities for Teacher Education

Activity 1: Discrepancies in Role Expectations

1. Type of Simulation: Role playing.
2. Purpose: To make teachers aware of the influence of conflicting role expectations on communication between home and school.
3. Material: Role descriptions for teacher, parent, and school social worker.
4. Activity: A Mexican-Americano (Chicano) parent meets with a teacher and a school social worker to discuss the academic progress of a student who has been referred to the social worker for "lack of motivation and academic failure." Each participant is provided with her/his own role description, but no one has access to role descriptions of the other actors. Following the session a group of observers identifies positive features of the role-playing episode, and makes suggestions for improved communication to the participants.

   (Note: The role specifications for this simulation are based, in part, on findings reported in Parra and Henderson (1980). Trainers may develop similar role playing simulations based on descriptive material pertaining to role perceptiors in other groups.)

Teacher role

The teacher assumes the child is uninterested in school work because the parents do not place a high value on education. S/he believes that children's intellectual potential is dependent upon the kind of intellectual stimulation experienced at home during the preschool years. Since the child in question is from a relatively poor Mexican-American family, s/he suspects that the

student's home environment provided little intellectual stimulation during the early childhood years. S/he suspects that the motivational problem may be partly a function of the child having too limited a field of intellectual experience to relate to curricular activities. The teacher is not sure that the effects of early environmental deficiencies can be entirely overcome, but s/he does believe it would help if the parents would expose the child to books, word games, and the like, and provide strong reinforcement for any kind of academic effort the child might display.

In brief, the teacher feels that it is the role of both parents and teachers to foster intellectual development and motivation for academic achievement. S/he imagines that these parents do not have very high aspirations for their children.

Parent role

The parent has been very concerned about the child's difficulty in school. S/he has been reluctant to initiate a conference because, while s/he does speak English, her/his limited vocabulary, frequent confusion of pronouns, and difficulties with verb tense and noun-verb agreement is a source of embarrassment with communicating with "educated" people. (S/he is aware of some of his/her specific problems with English because of recent participation on an adult education class.) Because s/he feels intimidated her/his manner during the conference is one of diffidence.

The father in this family works at strenuous manual labor, and he is periodically unemployed. The parents want something better for their children and have dreams of them going to college and entering a profession. But given their life circumstances and this child's present difficulties with school, the expectation that these dreams might be realized are more realistic than their aspirations.

These parents do value education, but they do not see the parent's role as a teacher of academic skills. In their view, teachers bear the primary responsibility for the intellectual and academic socialization of children. The primary responsibility of the home is to foster the child's social and emotional development. At the same time, the parents realize that children must function in a variety of settings, and they wish the school would be more sensitive to the child's social and emotional needs. The youngster who is the target of the present conference often comes home from school feeling defeated. The parents have almost stopped asking him/her how school went today because s/he has developed the feeling that s/he lacks the ability to do school work. S/he admits that s/he has stopped trying.

In summary, the parent is very concerned. S/he sees the roles of parents and teachers as partly overlapping but partly different. The primary socialization role of the school is to promote intellectual and academic development but teachers should also be concerned about social and emotional development. The parent's most important responsibility is to provide for healthy social and emotional development. That task is made difficult by the school's apparent insensitivity to these needs.

Social worker's role

The social worker is not well acquainted with the cultural background of the child in question, but s/he is sensitive to the possibility that cultural factors may be involved in the problem.

During the initial stages the social worker takes the role of facilitator. S/he tries to keep the parent and teacher communicating and on the topic. Her/his overall aims for this initial conference are 1) to identify the problem from both the teacher's and the parent's perspective, 2) to determine the conditions contributing to the problem, from the perspective of both

parties, 3) to identify some goals that are of mutual importance to the parent and teacher, and 4) to prioritize the goals for more detailed instructional planning in subsequent conferences.

As the discussion unfolds the social worker decides to add a more specific objective to the more general goals identified above. S/he will attempt to help the teacher and parent to develop some mutual role expectations to govern the interaction among teacher, parent, and student.

5. Suggestions for assessing the role playing:

   The group discussion of the role playing episode should include a consideration of the following questions:

   a. What misperceptions on the part of the teacher became apparent? (e.g., the expectation of low parental aspirations for the child).

   b. What discrepancies in role expectations for the statuses of parent and teacher were revealed?

   c. What effective techniques did the school social worker employ to achieve the conference goals and objectives?

   d. Did the teacher or social worker behave in any way that might inhibit open discussion (e.g., criticisms of the child instead of objective discussion of skills or maladaptive behaviors, such as reluctance to try tasks, or facial expressions in reaction to non-standard grammer)?

   e. Did the social worker use appropriate procedures to help move the discussion toward consensus (e.g., keeping the discussion focused, use of summary statements to show progress, etc.)?

   f. In arriving at mutual goals for the child, did the social worker make provision for both cognitive and socioemotional goals, and was this done with consideration of their interdependence?

   g. Was the importance of providing the child with skills for self-management as well as success experiences mentioned?

Activity 2: Sociocultural Variations in Motivation

1. Type of Simulation: In-basket
2. Purpose: To examine ways in which different types of motives may be used to promote academic effort.
3. Material: Memorandum from a building principal to the school counselor.
4. Activity: Participants read the memorandum and
   a) decide what additional information would be needed initially,
   b) decide how to obtain needed information
   c) formulate an hypothesis to explain the problem behavior described in the memo, and
   d) suggest an instructional alternative to be tested in the classroom.

Memorandum

TO: Mary Kahai, Counselor

FROM: Ken Kanaka, Principal, Bishop School

RE: Classroom Consultation

One of our 6th grade teachers, Ms. Jones, has been having trouble motivating students in her class. She is an experienced teacher and was apparently successful when she taught on the mainland, but this is her first year teaching in Hawaii. A number of the children in her class are Hawaiian-Americans. She has complained to me that the Hawaiian children seem to have very little achievement motivation and are therefore not likely to make much academic progress. She has tried to determine the current functioning level of each child and to individualize instruction on that basis. Thus she feels the work should not be too difficult, and she gives consistent social reinforcement for individual effort. Even so, the children cheat by helping one

another whenever they think they can get away with it.

Ms. Jones has asked if she could try a token economy in her class as a means of increasing academic effort. I did not say absolutely no, but I did ask her to talk with you about some possible alternatives before she goes ahead with it. It seems to me that some of the problems with this class may come from her being a newcomer who is unfamiliar with the sociocultural characteristics of these children.

As a teacher who has experienced a good deal of success working with these children, I would appreciate it if you would meet with Ms. Jones and me sometime soon to discuss this situation. My main purpose in writing prior to our meeting is to give you a chance to think about my idea that Ms. Jones' lack of familiarity with the culture may be part of the problem.

5. Suggested Responses

a) Information needed: You will probably need additional information on the way in which work activities are structured in the classroom. It would be particularly interesting to know how goals and incentives are organized.

b) Obtaining the information: The needed information might best be obtained through informal observation in the classroom. Observations could be guided by the question "Who benefits or receives reinforcement when children expend effort on tasks; the individual or the group?" Is the work of children compared with each other on a norm-referenced basis?

For purposes of the present sample response, assume you find that most work is reinforced on an individual basis, and that the performance of children is compared with each other.

c) Hypothesis: Hawaiian-American children will devote increased effort to academic tasks if the classroom goal structure is changed from the individualistic and competitive approaches that are now being used to a more cooperative strategy.

d) Rationale: Some research suggests that Hawaiian-American children are very peer oriented. They often try not to stand out from their peers by doing better than they do, and they may achieve greater satisfaction from assisting a friend than from individual accomplishment. There, a form of instructional organization that structures opportunities for children to help each other, and to work on cooperative learning tasks in which everyone in the group benefits, should be worth a try. Changing the goal structure in a way that makes classroom activities more compatible with the cultural priorities of the children may be less intrusive to the instructional process than a token economy would be, and individually awarded tokens may be counterproductive anyway, if the hypothesis is correct.

e) Counselor's suggestions: Try using the children's desire to support their peers and to subordinate themselves to the group by redefining what is meant by cheating. Make it possible for children to refine their own skills by helping each other. Set up some tasks so that each child can contribute at his/her own level to group objectives. Reinforce the group for collective accomplishment. Avoid norm referenced comparisons of the performance of individual children.

Take observational recordings of on task behavior for about a week before implementing the change. Continue to keep records after the change in procedures, to see if the desired change in effort takes place. In this practical situation a reversal condition

would probably not be implemented. Most teachers, understandably, would want to let well enough alone. (The counselor would be expected to devise the system for observational recording that would not be an unmanageable burden on the teacher.)

Activity 3: Family characteristics, learned helplessness, and alienation

1. Type of simulation: case study
2. Purpose: To examine alternatives to stereotyped explanations for behavior problems and poor academic performance.
3. Material: Case study with information on family background, school achievement, intelligence test performance, and teacher and psychologist interpretations of data.
4. Activity: Critique the case study on the basis of what you know about sociocultural characteristics, patterns of teacher/student interaction, and learned helplessness.

The critique should suggest alternative interpretations and recommended actions.

Case Study

Andrew: Age, 13-1, Grade 7.

Andrew W. is a black 7th grader living in an inner city area. School records indicate that his mother is unmarried and that she supports her family by working as a hotel maid. Andrew has three sisters and a younger brother.

Andrew's teacher is concerned about his poor academic performance and disruptive behavior in the classroom. He seldom pays attention to instructions, and finds as many ways as possible to avoid starting on an assigned task. He often dismisses an assignment by saying "I can't do that." Even when

he does start on an assignment he seldom sticks with it for long. Instead, he moves about the room disturbing the work of other students. When he does work on an assignment he rushes through it, putting down poorly thought out answers and displaying minimum effort.

A standardized achievement test administered at the beginning of the year indicated that his math performance was at grade level 5.2, while reading was 4.1.

Academic achievement is not the only source of concern. The teacher thinks he shows signs of mild emotional or social maladjustment. This conclusion is based largely on Andrew's apparent inability to concentrate on school tasks, and on the fact that he seems to have little ability to control impulses in the classroom. For example, when he does participate in a class discussion that interests him, he blurts out his ideas without waiting his turn. On some occasions when the teacher "gets on his case" about that, he has responded by getting up and leaving school for the rest of the day. His attendance is marked by frequent absences. Anecdotal records in the file indicate a history of this behavior and the fact teachers have interpreted these behaviors as signs of poor social adjustment and lack of respect.

Since Andrew is a poor student, the teacher regards him as an undesirable role model for his peers. S/he is distressed that the other students seem to look up to Andrew. This is a particular concern because Andrew has a great deal of influence with his peers. They gather around him, listening to his hip talk in which seems an admiring way. He can get most of the kids in his class to do about anything he wants them to.

Recently, his teacher referred him for testing. So far only one test, the WISC-R, has been administered. The verbal IQ was 84, the performance IQ was 100, and the full scale IQ 90. The teacher wanted an MA score to get

a notion of Andrew's developmental level. The psychologist reported a test age of 11.6.

In a conference the teacher and school psychologist agreed the problem was probably a motivational one, since Andrew was not performing up to his potential, as indicated by the WISC-R. The teacher suggested that the lack of an achievement oriented male role model in Andrew's home may be responsible for his lack of interest in academic work, and his failure to put forth the necessary effort to achieve. The psychologist agreed. Since Andrew does not seem responsive to the teacher's attempts at positive social reinforcement, the psychologist finds it difficult to recommend an intervention that might overcome the effects of apparent deficiencies in the home environment. The recommended action was to meet with Andrew's mother and try to convince her that the boy be assigned to the resource teacher, on a "pull-out" basis.

5. Suggested Response:

The assessment that Andrew's basic problem is a motivational one is probably correct, but the explanation for it may not be.

Even though the WISC-R may be culturally biased, the fact that Andrew's academic performance is lower than one would predict on the basis of IQ scores suggests that he may be achieving less than he might be able to achieve. In fact, the WISC-R verbal IQ is very likely depressed as a result of the middle class bias of the language tasks sampled by the test. This is suggested both by the higher performance score and by Andrew's apparent facility in the use of language to influence his peers.

Alternative explanations for Andrew's lack of academic motivation and disruptions of the class should have been explored. First, it is possible that Andrew has experienced a long history of failure on academic tasks, and he may be convinced that even with effort he cannot succeed. By finding

ways to avoid trying, or expending effort, he may escape the humiliation of attributing failure to himself. Since teachers tend to respond more favorably to students who pay attention and try than those who do not, the problem is perpetuated and performance may show increasing deterioration.

When Andrew bursts into a discussion without waiting his turn, it may be as much an indication of interest as of lack of respect or social maladjustment. When this show of enthusiasm is rebuffed, Andrew is likely to see it as confirmation that his efforts will always be received negatively. Alienation is a natural response to such "no win" situations.

The hypothesis that the motivational problem derives from family circumstances is non-productive. Even if one accepts the stereotyped explanation, educators cannot place an achievement oriented male role model in the child's home and convert the family into the nuclear prototype so valued (in spite of its steady demise) by white, middle class Americans.

The alternative hypothesis, that the observed pattern of behavior has been derived largely from the boy's experiences in school lends itself more easily to instructional modification. Rather than remove Andrew from the class, it would be fruitful to search for ways to capitalize on Andrew's ability to influence his peers. Make success possible for him by giving him a role in setting his own objectives and taking responsibility for the monitoring of his own progress. Once success is possible, Andrew should be helped to see the relationship of effort to outcomes. An atmosphere in which cooperative rather than competitive goal structures predominate would probably facilitate the process, and such goals would articulate well to efforts to structure situations in which Andrew can have a positive influence on his peers (cf. Johnson & Johnson, in this series).

Activity 4: Attention, task persistence, learned helplessness, teacher expectancies, social system perspective

1. Type of Simulation: Transcript of interchange

2. Purpose: To identify and critique the central assumption of the interchange, with particular attention to implications of the social system perspective and the literature on learned helplessness and teacher expectancies.

3. Material: Transcript of an interchange between a teacher and a school principal.

4. Activity: Participants will read the transcript and

a) identify the main assumption regarding the problem behaviors discussed.

b) suggest an alternative explanation incorporating information on teacher expectancies, learned helplessness and the social system perspective.

Transcript

The following transcript provides a record of an interchange between a teacher and a principal. They are discussing a child for whom the teacher has requested psychological assessment. The child is George, a black third grader.

Teacher (T): I am concerned about George. He isn't making much progress in this class and I think he may have a learning disability. He doesn't pay attention, and when he bothers to do his written work he hurries through it without caring what answers he puts down. He just doesn't seem to take notice of any of the details of the assigned exercises. It's bad enough that he doesn't pay attention to his own work, but he is continually out of his seat bothering other children. According to the teachers who had him before he has been this way since the very beginning. I think he should be referred for psychological evaluation. He might be better off in

a special class.

Principal (P): What do you do when these things happen: When he doesn't pay attention, for example?

T: Well, I tell him to look at me and pay attention when I give directions, and to get it the first time because I don't intend to keep repeating the instructions.

P: And what about his failure to attend to details in the written work you assign?

T: Well, I don't know exactly what it is. It's probably more than just one thing. As I said, he doesn't seem to notice details. But mostly I think he just doesn't care, or isn't willing to put out the effort. He almost seems proud that he doesn't try. Then, of course, there is his hyperactivity. I suppose it's all part of the same problem. He just can't, or won't, attend. He's all over the room when he should be working. It seems like I'm continually telling him to sit down and do his work and to stop disturbing the other children. Once I do get him back to work he's very distractible. Any little thing that happens will pull his attention away from his work. He just has no task persistence at all.

P: Well, you could be right. There could be a learning disability. If he's having perceptual and attentional problems, for example, that could explain why he has trouble with details and tends to be so distractible. I will schedule him for assessment next week and maybe the psychologist can figure out what the problem is.

5. Suggested Responses

a) George is being labeled as inattentive, distractible, and hyperactive. The tone of this conversation suggests that these characteristics are assumed to be qualities within the individual. The

search for a learning disability diagnosis suggests a medical model interpretation of George's problem.

b) If George has displayed this pattern of behavior for a long time, as information from his former teachers suggests, there is a good chance that teacher expectations regarding his potential academic performance have been low all along. Remarks of the present teacher suggest that much of her interaction with George is aimed at controlling his behavior rather than teaching him specific content or skills. Initial failure to conform to achievement and behavioral norms may thus have put George in a position of failing at school tasks, receiving responses that did little to help him acquire necessary skills for successful performance, followed by further failures. If that were the case, he could well come to feel incapable of doing the tasks presented at school. According to what is known about learned helplessness, diminished effort and lack of attention would be predicted in that situation.

If this scenario were true, George's behavior could be better understood from a social structure than from a medical model perspective. The labels being arrived at designate his status in the classroom social system. They are not traits that are intrinsic to his biological nature, or evidences of disease. The labels carry expectations that may influence George's continuing behavior and the behavior of others toward him in the school situation.

V. Readings and References

A. Primary Readings

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

This book presents an extensive review of research on teacher expectancies and variations in teacher-pupil interaction patterns. Relationships between interaction patterns and student characteristics are presented. Successful approaches for changing interaction patterns that bias the learning opportunities of children are described.

Cordasco, F., & Bucchioni, E. The Puerto Rican experience: A sociological sourcebook. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman & Littlefield, 1973

This sourcebook may be used as an alternative to J. M. Ballardo. It provides information on the island background and the migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland. A separate section deals with repression and resistance, and with conflict and acculturation processes on the mainland. The section entitled "Education on the Mainland" is especially relevant to the concepts presented in this module.

English, R. A. Socialization and black family life. In L. E. Gary (Ed.), Social research and the black community: Selected issues and priorities. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Urban Affairs and Research, Howard University, 1974, pp. 39-52.

Gallardo, J. M. (Ed.), The Puerto Rican experience (Proceedings of the conference on education of Puerto Rican Children on the Mainland, Oct. 18-21, 1970). New York: Arno Press, 1975.

This slim volume contains a collection of papers on educational problems faced by Puerto Ricans on the mainland. Reactions of conference participants to each presentation are included. Language problems and the need for bilingual education forms a major theme. Presentations on the cultural background of the Puerto Rican child by Juan J. Maunez and Carmen Silva Garcia are of particular relevance to this module segment.

Lightfood, S. L. Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

This book may be used as an alternative to the chapter by English. In this book a chapter entitled "Boundaries and Bridges" describes the conflict between schools and black families. Concepts from structural sociology (e.g., role definitions and expectations) are called upon to describe home/school discontinuities. Due attention is also given to discrepancies between theoretical conceptions of Parsonian sociologists and the real environments of children. Chapter 4, entitled "Black Dreams and Closed Doors" challenges the assumption that blacks have low educational aspirations with historical information on the importance blacks have attributed to education. See the review of this book by R. W. Henderson, Journal of School Psychology, 1980, 18, (1).

Montiel, M. The Chicano family: A review of research. Social Work, March, 1973, 22-31.

This article presents a critical examination of research on the Chicano family, the "machismo cult," socialization processes, and interventions designed to remedy presumed deficiencies in the functioning of Chicago individuals and their families.

B. References

Adams, G. R. Racial membership and physical attractiveness effects on preschool teachers' expectations. Child Study Journal, 1978, 8, 29-41.

Ames, C., Ames, R., & Felker, D. W. Effects of competitive reward structure and valence of outcome on children's achievement attributions. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1977, 69, 1-8.

Andrews, G. R., & Debus, G. R. Persistence and causal perception of failure: Modifying cognitive attributions. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70, 154-166.

Arlin, M., & Whitley, T. W. Perceptions of self-managed learning opportunities and academic locus of control: A causal interpretation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70, 988-992.

Bandura, A. Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Bergan, J. R., & Henderson, R. W. Child development. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill, 1979.

Bergan, J. R., & Parra, E. Variations in IQ testing and the letter-learning and achievement of Anglo and bilingual Mexican-American children. Unpublished manuscript, University of Arizona, 1978.

Blackwell, J. E. The black community: Diversity and unity. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1975.

Bloom, B. S. Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974.

Byalick, R., & Bersoff, D. N. Reinforcement practices of black and white teachers in integrated classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 473-480.

Byers, P., & Byers, H. Non-verbal communication in the education of children. In C. Cazden, V. John, and D. Hymes (Eds.). Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Cooper, H. M. Pygmalion grows up: A model for teacher expectations communication and performance influence. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 389-410.

Covington, M. V., & Omelich, C. L. Effort: The double-edged sword in school achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 169-182.

Diener, C. E., & Dweck, C. S. An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 451-462.

Doebler, L. K., & Eicke, F. J. Effects of teacher awareness of the educational implications of field-dependent/field-independent cognitive style on selected classroom variables. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 226-232.

Dollinger, S. J., & Laub, S. I. The interaction of locus of control expectancies and providing purpose on children's motivation. Journal of Research in Personality, 1977, 11, 118-127.

Dusek, J. B., & O'Connell, E. J. Teacher expectancy effects on the achievement test performance of elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65, 371-377.

Dweck, C. S. The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 27, 674-685.

Dweck, C. S., & Bush, E. S. Sex differences in learned helplessness: I. Differential debilitation with peer and adult evaluators. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 147-156.

Dweck, C. S., & Reppucci, N. D. Learned helplessness and reinforcement responsibility in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 109-116.

Elashoff, J., & Snow, R. E. (Eds.) Pygmalion revisited. Worthington, Ohio: C. A. Jones, 1971.

English, R. Beyond pathology: Research and theoretical perspectives on black families. In L. E. Gary (Ed.), Social research and the black community: Selected issues and priorities. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Urban Affairs and Research, Howard University, 1974.

Farris, B. E., & Glenn, N. D. Fatalism and familism among Anglos and Mexican Americans in San Antonio. Sociology and Social Research, 1976, 60, 393-402.

Foster, G., & Ysseldyke, J. Expectancy and halo effects as a result of artificially induced teacher bias. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1979, 4, 121-131.

Frieze, I., & Weiner, B. Cue utilization and attributional judgments for success and failure. Journal of Personality, 1971, 39, 591-606.

Gallimore, R. Affiliation motivation and Hawaiian-American achievement. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1974, 5, 481-491.

Gay, G., & Abrahams, R. D. Black culture in the classroom. In R. D. Abrahams & R. C. Troike (Eds.), Language and cultural diversity in American education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Gillung, T. B., & Rucker, C. N. Labels and teacher expectations. Exceptional Children, 1977, 43, 464-465.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. Changing teacher and student behavior: An empirical investigation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 390-405.

Grebler, L., Moore, J. W., & Guzman, R. C. The Mexican American people: The nation's second largest minority. New York: Free Press, 1970.

Griffith, B. American me. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1948.

Hawkes, G. R., & Taylor, M. Power structure in Mexican and Mexican-American farm labor families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37, 1975, 807-811.

Heller, C. S. Mexican-American youth: Forgotten youth at the crossroads. New York: Random House, 1966.

Henderson, R. W. Home environment and intellectual performance. In R. W. Henderson (Ed.), Parent-child interaction: Theory, research, and prospects. New York: Academic Press, 1981.

Henderson, R. W. Personal and social causation in the school school context. In J. Worell (Ed.), Psychological development in the elementary years. New York: Academic Press, 1982, pp. 359-407.

Henderson, R. W., & Hennig, H. Relationships among cooperation-competition and locus of control in academic situations among children in traditional and open classrooms. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1979, 4, 121-131.

Henderson, R. W., & Merritt, C. B. Environmental backgrounds of Mexican-American children with different potentials for school success. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 75, 101-106.

Holtzman, W. H., Diaz-Guerrero, R., & Swartz, J. D. in collaboration with Lara-Tapia, L., Laosa, L. M., Morales, M. L., Reyes Lagunes, I., & Witzke, D. B. Personality development in two cultures: A cross-cultural longitudinal study of school children in Mexico and the United States. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.

Johnson. D. W., & Johnson, R. T. Promoting constructive student-student relationships through cooperative learning. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1980.

Kagan, S., & Buriel, R. Field dependence-independence and Mexican-American culture and education. In J. L. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Kifer, E. Relationships between academic achievement and personality characteristics: A quasi-longitudinal study. American Educational Research Journal, 1975, 12, 191-210.

Kirk, S. A., & Gallagher, J. J. Educating exceptional children (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1979.

Klein, S. S. Student influences on teacher behavior. American Educational Research Journal, 1971, 8, 403-422.

Kluckhorn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. Variations in value orientations. New York: Row, Peterson, 1961.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhorn, C. Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions. New York: Vintage Books, 1952.

Laosa, L. M. Families as facilitators of children's intellectual development at three years of age: A causal analysis. In L. M. Laosa & I. M. Sigel (Eds.), Families as Learning Environments for Children. New York: Plenum Publishing Company (in press a).

Laosa, L. M. Inequality in the classroom: Observational research on teacher-student interactions. Aztlan International Journal of Chicano Studies Research, 1978, 8.

Laosa, L. M. Maternal behavior: Sociocultural diversity in modes of family interaction. In R. W. Henderson (Ed.), Parent-child interaction: Theory, research, and prospects. New York: Academic Press, 1981, pp. 3-32.

Laosa, L. M. Social competence in childhood: Toward a developmental, socioculturally relativistic paradigm. In M. W. Kent & J. E. Rolf (Eds.). Primary prevention of psychopathology. Vol. III: Social competence in children. Handover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1979.

Laosa, L. M. School, occupation, culture, and family: The impact of parental schooling on the parent-child relationship. Journal of Educational Psychology, (in press b).

Laosa, L. M., & DeAvila, E. A. Development of cognitive styles among Chicanos in traditional and dualistic communities. International Journal of Psychology, 1979, 14, 91-98.

Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1976.

Lewis, D. Education and sense modality: Class and culture conflict in the schools. Unpublished manuscript, Oakes College, University of California, Santa Cruz. No date.

Lewis, O. Five families. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Lewis, O. Children of Sanchez. New York: Random House, 1961.

Lewis, O. La Vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty. New York: Random House, 1966.

Lilly, M. S. (Ed.) Children with exceptional needs. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1979.

Lockheed, M. E. Some causes and consequences of teacher expectations concerning pupil performance. California Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 4, 40-56.

Luce, S. R. & Hoge, R. D. Relations among teacher rankings, pupil-teacher interactions, and academic achievement: A test of the teacher expectancy hypothesis. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15, 489-500.

Madsen, W. The Mexican-American of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Mercer, J. Sociological perspectives on mental retardation. In H. C. Haywood (Ed.), Social-cultural aspects of mental retardation: Proceedings of the Peabody NIMH Conference. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, pp. 378-391.

Mercer, J. Labeling the mentally retarded: Clinical and social system perspectives on mental retardation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Montiel, M. The Chicano family: A review of research. Social Work, March, 1973, 22-31.

Montiel, M. The social science myth of the Mexican-American family. El Grito, 1970, 3, 56-63.

Moynihan, D. P. The Negro family: The case for national action. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Labor, March, 1967.

Parra, E. & Henderson, R. W. Mexican-American perceptions of parent and teacher roles in child development. In J. A. Fishman & G. D. Keller (Eds.), Bilingual education for hispanic students in the United States. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1982, pp. 289-299.

Parsons, T. The social structure of the family. In R. N. Anshen (Ed.), The family: Its function and destiny. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.

Paz, O. The labyrinth of solitude: Life and thought in Mexico. New York: Grove Press, 1961.

Pettigrew, T. A profile of the Negro American. Princeton, N.J.: D. VanNostrand, 1964.

Ramirez, M. Cognitive styles and cultural democracy in education. Social Science Quarterly, 1973, 53, 895-904.

Ramirez, M. III & Castaneda, A. Cultural democracy, bicognitive development, and education. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rhodes, W. C. The disturbing child: A problem of ecological management. Exceptional Children, 1967, 33, 449-455.

Riessman, F. The slow gifted child. In J. Gallagher (Ed.), Teaching gifted students: A book of readings. Boston: Allyn & Brown, 1965.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobsen, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Ross, M. B., & Salvia, J. Attractiveness as a biasing factor in teacher judgments. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1975, 80, 96-98.

Sanders, M. & Scholz, J. P. Field independence match-mismatch and school achievement gains of Anglo American and Mexican American children. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association Meetings, Los Angeles, April, 1976.

Staples, R. & Mirande, A. Racial and cultural variations among American families: A decennial review of the literature on minority families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1980, 887-903.

Thomas, A. Learned helplessness and expectancy factors: Implications for research in learning disabilities. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 200-221.

Valencia, R. R., Henderson, R. W., & Rankin, R. J. Relationship of family constellation and schooling to intellectual performance of Mexican American children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, 73, 524, 532.

Weisz, J. R. Perceived control and learned helplessness among mentally retarded children: A developmental analysis. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 311-319.

Williams, T. Teacher prophecies and the inheritance of inequality. Sociology of Education, 1976, 49, 223-236.

Willis, S. & Brophy, J. Origins of teachers' attitudes toward young children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 520-529.

Winetsky, C. S. Comparisons of the expectations of parents and teachers for the behavior of preschool children. Child Development, 1978, 49, 1146-1154.

Witkin, H. A. A cognitive style approach to cross-cultural research. International Journal of Psychology, 1967, 2, 233-250.

Woods, F. J. Cultural values of American ethnic groups. New York: Harper, 1956.

APPENDIX A

Key to Self Assessment Items

The code following the answers indicates the major concept/sub-concept and page numbers where the material is located.

1. Choice b is correct. Culture is a broad concept encompassing all of the learned, shared, and transmitted behaviors characteristic of a group of people. Culture can refer to the characteristic habits of a large group of people, such as those who are members of the society of the United States of America, or to more restricted groups, such as Mexican-Americans or Sioux Indians. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/culture/ pp. 13-14)

2. Choice a is correct. As the concept is used by American anthropologists and sociologists, the term society refers to the collection of individuals who live together in an organized population. The focus is on the people rather than on their behaviors. Society is distinguished from culture in that culture focuses on customary behaviors and products of behavior shared among people in a given society. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/ society/ p. 14)

3. Choice c is correct. A social status is a position within a social system. Available statuses may be named (e.g., child, school psychologist), and each individual occupies several statuses simultaneously. The behaviors that are expected of an individual occupying a given status constitute the role for that status. Ascribed statuses are based on characteristics that are not subject to purposeful modification. (Social status/social role/ pp. 14-15)

4. Choice d is correct. From the social system perspective, children acquire various statuses on the basis of their behavior in one or more of the social systems in which they participate. These statuses include designations such as retarded student, gifted student, and emotionally disturbed student. Mental retardation and emotional disturbance are the designations for the roled (expected behaviors) associated with the social statuses of mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. (Social status/social role/ pp. 14-15)

5. Choice b is correct. Locus of control refers to characteristic expectations an individual has concerning whether s/he has control over his/her circumstances, or whether such matters are beyond his/her personal control. The first of these conditions is referred to as internal control, the second as external control. The term experimental control has nothing to do with individual locus of control perception. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/locus of control/p. 40)

6. Most social science literature has portrayed the black family as a single parent family dominated by a mother. This family form has been identified as the source of various social problems. The claim has been

made that this form is derived from conditions of slavery which broke up family units. Revisionist scholars have presented neglected data indicating that even in slave times, a sizeable proportion of blacks managed to maintain two parent families, and the stereotyped single parent matriarchical family does not represent the majority of black families in either the past or the present. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/family characteristics/pp. 18-20).

7. Traditionally, the social science literature has presented the Mexican-American family as a father dominated authoritarian structure. The father's word was law and his wife and children were expected to behave with unquestioning obedience. The wife's place was in the home, and the father represented the family in matters outside the household. This family type is usually presented as though it were present with only minor modification in Mexican-American and Chicano households. The Mexican family and the transplanted version of it is described as an extended family unit, with households including grandparents, married offspring, and their spouses and children, and sometimes other relatives.

   This family form is usually contrasted with the nuclear family that is considered typical among middle-class Anglo-Americans. A nuclear family consists of only a husband and wife and their own biological offspring.

   Mexican-American scholars have recently challenged this characterization with data suggesting that even in Mexico the extended family is not as common as has been suggested, and that among Mexican-American families, egalitarian values are dominant over authoritarian, patriarchial values. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/family characteristics/pp. 20-22)

8. In psychology there has been a widespread belief that achievement motivation is essential to academic and economic advancement. Affiliation motivation, on the other hand, has been considered as detrimental to the kind of individualistic achievement necessary for academic success. Those who are more motivated by affiliation needs than by individualistic achievement strivings are likely to put concern for interpersonal relationships and obligations over economic personal gain or a competitive advantage in scholarship. Some recent research with Hawaiian groups suggests that affiliation motivation need not interfere with academic achievement. Positive correlations between affiliation motivation and achievement have been reported. Affiliation motivation and achievement motivation might be alternative systems, each of which might have advantages within the value context of given cultures. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/maturation/pp. 27-28)

9. Much of the literature on Latin American culture has stressed the fatalistic outlook of people from these groups. When an individual fails it is seen as the work of fate rather than a circumstance to be overcome. Some research suggests that the fatalistic orientation described for Puerto Ricans and Mexicans may not be applicable to Hispanic families in the United States. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/family characteristics/pp. 28-29)

10. The popular stereotype of the Mexican-American family as a structure in which children cannot question authority goes on to suggest that these rigid socialization patterns produce uncreative children with field dependent cognitive styles. Mexican-American child rearing practices are also purported to inhibit initiative and individualistic achievement patterns. Revisionist scholars have condemned these overdrawn generalizations. Research with Mexican-American families has demonstrated a substantial degree of heterogeneity. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/socialization/pp. 20-27)

11. Research on cultural differences in cognitive style has shown with some consistency that Mexican-American children tend to be field dependent while Anglo children tend to be more field independent. Within each group, however, the range of individual differences is substantial, and some research has failed to show such differences.

    Some investigators advocate that children should be taught by teachers whose cognitive style matches their own. The research on this approach is inconsistent in its results. Others advocate that teachers be made sensitive to both cognitive styles and that instruction be organized to help children to function "bicognitively." This approach awaits thorough evaluation and replication. (Cultural diversity and stereotyping/cognitive style/pp. 23-27)

12. Because of incongruities between the cultures of the home and school, a minority child may lack precursor skills that many teachers take for granted and never teach directly. Thus, this child's chances for initial failure may be greater than those of a middle class child. The greater the discrepancy between the cultures of the school and the home, the greater is the possibility of initial failure.

    Besides the possibilities for early failure on standard school tasks, teachers often hold expectations or poor classroom behavior and less potential for academic progress for children from minority and lower socioeconomic groups. The combination of the child's difficulty with initial school tasks and the teacher's expectations may influence the teacher to spend a disproportionate number of contacts with this child managing his/her behavior rather than communicating curriculum relevant content and skills. As a result, the child may fall further and further behind, and a pattern of failure may set in. If the child has been expending effort on the school tasks, s/he may come to believe that failure is the result of a lack of ability to do academic work. A maladaptive pattern whereby tasks are not initiated and effort is withheld may develop as the child comes to feel helpless to overcome these difficulties.

    The perception of helplessness may be limited to academic tasks. A black child with a good jive walk and facility with hip talk may be a leader in the peer group even if not the shining star of things teachers hold dear. (Teacher expectations and student performance/ learned helplessness/pp. 30-57)

13. Teachers often hold expectancies that minority children will fail to make good academic progress, and that their behavior is more likely to be disruptive than that of non-minority students. These expectancies

may be influenced by a variety of circumstances, including special labels applied to children, and actual observation of behavior and achievement. Whatever the determinant of the expectation, the teacher is likely to spend less time in supportive interactions with these students, and more time in efforts to dominate and control social behavior. Communications are likely to involve less information about skills and information the child needs to progress academically, and more behavior management concerns. Minority children who fall into this pattern of interactions with their teachers are deprived of full access to the curriculum. (Teacher expectations and student performance/differential student/teacher interaction patterns/pp. 30-57)

14. There is considerable variability in children's behavior when they enter school. If teachers and psychologists do not take special pains to assure that children have the necessary precursor skills to accomplish the tasks presented to them, they have a slim chance of accomplishing the instructional objectives. Each objective may be pre-requisite to others, so the child in this condition slips progressively further behind those children who possess the prerequisite skills.

    Children whose behavior violates the cultural expectation of teachers are also likely to be at an initial disadvantage in the classroom, and the effects of the disadvantage may be cumulative. Culture violating behavior becomes the focus for conflict with the teacher. Instructional time is consumed in confrontation and behavior management rather than content and skill related interactions. (Teacher expectations and student performance/group norms/pp. 30-39)

APPENDIX B

Responses to Exercises

Exercise 1

Objectives: No. 3, No. 4, No. 6

Model Response

Responses to this exercise will differ depending on the groups chosen for comparison and your own knowledge of the groups in question. Past experience with this exercise suggests that the characteristics listed often reflect sterotyped views of ethnic and racial groups. Responses such as "lack of future time orientation," "uninterested in school learning," and "unable to delay gratification" are common with reference to several minority groups. Rarely can the characteristics listed by justified as broadly applicable generalizations about the "culture" of the groups named. As you will see in this section, conceptions that social scientists have offered to help educators become more knowledgeable concerning the children they teach have sometimes contributed to cultural stereotyping.

Exercise 2

Objectives: No. 1c, No. 1d, No. 1e, No. 2

Model Response

Mental retardation is defined in relationship to specific social situations. The behavior of an individual may be seen as deviant or sub-normal in the school situation while behavior of the same individual in another social setting may not be considered as deviant at all. In the first of these situations developmental deviance may be considered as an acquired status. The person who occupies this status and is labeled as retarded plays that role, and other people relate to those who occupy the status of mentally retarded in accordance with the behavioral expectations for the role associated with that status. Educators should remember, and help their colleagues to understand, that from a social system perspective, mental retardation is a designation for a position within a social system rather than a quality of the individual. The same may be true for other statuses, such as emotionally disturbed.

Exercise 3

Objectives: No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4

Model Response

The specific response to this exercise will depend on what groups are chosen for attention. In general, however, social scientists have used pathology

Exercise 3 (continued)

models to describe the influence of a number of minority group families on their children. The matriarchial form common among black families and the authoritarian, patriarchial form ascribed to Hispanics have been seen as providing socialization experiences that are detrimental to the development of the kind of motivation assumed to be necessary to academic success. Hispanic groups have also been described as fatalistic--a quality considered to inhibit the use of effort to overcome obstacles. It now appears that many of these conclusions were overgeneralizations from limited samples, and do not represent conditions present in the majority of minority group families. Furthermore, long range achievement and adjustment do not depend solely on the characteristics the child brings to school. Just as important is the response these characteristics elicit from educators. Over the long haul, the reciprocal relationship is likely to be the determining factor. This suggests that educators should be aware of these interactions and make sure that children are not treated in a way that deprives them of skill and content relevant interactions.

Exercise 4

Objectives: No. 1k, No. 1l, No. 1m, No. 1n, No. 3, No. 6

Model Response

There appear to be group differences in preferences for modalities (e.g., aural-oral vs. literacy) and cognitive styles (e.g., field dependence/independence. However, these differences only represent differences between the averages of groups. There is a substantial range of individual variation within a given group on dimensions such as these. Thus, care should be exercised to avoid stereotyped assumptions that a given child will have a given style or preference on the basis of her/his group membership.

While there are average differences between groups on both cognitive style and socialization dimensions, that does not necessarily mean that the socialization practices produced the preferences with which they are statistically associated. The causal relationship has not been firmly demonstrated for any given socialization pattern and a given style. Furthermore, ethnic group membership and socioeconomic status are often confounded in studies that compare groups on dimensions such as these. Thus, one cannot assume that authoritarian child rearing, for example, leads to field dependence. Where there is reason to believe that children are unable to profit from a given type of curriculum or method of instruction, that suspicion may be a justifiable basis to experiment with instructional adaptations aimed at providing materials and methods that are congruent with the child's approach to the processing of information.

While instructional adaptation is desirable, the utility of formal diagnosis to that process has not been clearly demonstrated. Cognitive style, for example, may be measured in different ways, and those different approaches do not consistently yield the same assessment. Moreover, the measures that

Exercise 4 (continued)

have been used in most descriptive and laboratory research do not yield clear predictions of children's responses to different instructional approaches.

Informal behavioral assessment of children's responses to given kinds of instruction is probably a better basis for adapting to the instructional needs of given children than "personality" measures. It is best to be sensitive to needs suggested by children's approaches to specific materials and instructional styles. Flexibility in style should be the aim. For example, if there really are group differences in modality preferences, children from a literacy tradition may be as much in need of aural-oral practice as children with aural-oral capabilities are in need of skills associated with literacy.

Exercise 5

Objectives: No. 2

Model Response

You might suggest that the teacher capitalize on the children's supportiveness toward one another and on their concern for the group by organizing learning activities around a cooperative goal structure. As a school psychologist you might also help to design the means by which the teacher may assess the effects of this instructional adjustment on attitudes toward learning. Systematic observational recordings of time on task and task completion would be appropriate. Information on affective responses to the change would also be important.

Exercise 6

Objectives: No. 1p, No. 1q, No. 2, No. 3, No. 7, No. 8

Model Response

First, it is not at all clear that Hispanic populations in the United States are any more fatalistic than other groups. Fatalism reported for these groups may actually only reflect greater feelings of futility on the part of people of limited education or economic means, and people of Hispanic heritage are over represented in the lower economic segments of American society. Some evidence indicates that when level of education was controlled, Mexican-Americans and Anglos did not differ on the dimension of fatalism.

Some children whose social behavior or preparation for formal school work differs from the norms of the classroom may seem fatalistic about their school work because a pattern of failure experiences sets in early. They may learn to feel helpless, or to believe that they lack the ability to succeed at academic work. Accordingly, they may try less because previous experience has taught them that they cannot overcome their academic difficulties with effort.

Exercise 7

Objective: No. 5

Model Response:

Research has shown that teachers hold different expectations for children who vary along a number of personal characteristics and behavioral dimensions. The following variables have been found to be associated with differential teacher expectations and behaviors:

student sex
student social class
student ethnicity
student English language proficiency
student physical attractiveness
student achievement
student academic motivation

It has not been clearly demonstrated that these characteristics themselves are the main determinants of teacher expectancies and responses to students. It seems reasonably clear that most teachers do not respond to children solely on the basis of their racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic class identity. This section develops the argument that teachers are likely to respond to sociocultural characteristics that vary within subcultural groups.

Exercise 8

Objective: No. 5

Model Response

Teacher's communications to students for whom they hold high expectations tend to be more supportive, more reinforcing, and more related to the skills and content of instruction than are their messages to students for whom their expectations are low. Conversely, teacher behavior toward low-expectancy students tends to be less supportive and more aimed at behavioral control and management, as compared with their interactions with children for whom they hold high expectations.

Exercise 9

Objectives: No. 2, No. 5, No. 7, No. 8

Model Response

Students from a variety of culturally diverse backgrounds may lack the precursor skills and concepts necessary to succeed at the tasks presented in school. To the degree that the concepts learned in the family context differ from those assumed by the curriculum children may be at risk to fall into a pattern of failure. Children who experience failure even when they try may come to feel helpless to overcome their difficulties with school learning.

Exercise 9 (continued)

Consequently, effort may be reduced. Children who experience such feelings of helplessness often fail even at tasks that are within their capability. Teachers and support personnel involved in the assessment of children who have experienced repeated failure should take steps to make sure they are testing capability, in so far as possible, rather than just performance. Careful attention to motivation and reinforcement of effort attributions may help. Even so, interpretations of test results should be tempered by the realization that children who have experienced repeated failure experiences in school may be more capable than test results suggest.

Exercise 10

Objective: No. 9

Model Response

The teacher could use any of the following approaches that have proved to help in alleviating feelings of learned helplessness:

1. Make sure the student is provided with a purpose for learning. "You will need it when you grow up" is a cop out.

2. Include the students in the decision-making process relating to the determination of goals and activities.

3. Teach self-management skills to support the students involvement in goal and activity selection.

4. Establish non-competitive goal structures, in which norm-referenced comparisons are avoided.

5. Cue and reinforce effort attributions.

6. Provide reattribution training.

Racial and Cultural Variations among American Families: A Decennial Review of the Literature on Minority Families*

ROBERT STAPLES**
University of California at San Francisco
ALFREDO MIRANDÉ***
University of California at Riverside

This article is a review and assessment of the past decade's literature on Asian-American, black, Chicano, and Native American families. The authors report that, prior to 1970, minority families were subject to negative stereotypes which were not empirically supported. In the case of blacks and Chicanos, the family literature of the 1970s represented an improvement because it depicted the positive aspects of their family life. Theory and research on Asian and Native American families remained too limited to make any generalizations about their family lifestyles. The insider-outsider perspective continued to be a source of controversy in the study of minority families.

As an institution the family continues to be a subject of intense and controversial public concern. This interest is generated, in part, by the lack of concensus on what its form and function should be. In the case of minority groups, the controversy is heightened by their depiction in the literature and an ongoing debate over how their family lifestyles relate to the larger society. Before examining how this issue was expressed in the family literature of the seventies, it is necessary to place some parameters around our definition of minorities. Too global a definition of "minority" militates against the purpose and scope of this decade review. Hence, those groups of interest are any collectivity whose membership is derived from a shared racial identity, with high visibility in the society and a devalued social status: *i.e.*, Asians, blacks, Chicanos and Native Americans.

Given the American commitment to the concept of a melting pot (*i.e.*, the blending of diverse racial and ethnic groups into a standard prototype), there should be no need to study minority families separately. However, that ideal has never been translated into reality. Instead, we have what Gordon (1964) has described as "Anglo conformity": an assumption of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon culture and the devaluation of all other forms. This conflict between the melting pot theory and the dictates of Anglo conformity is expressed nowhere better than in the family literature on minorities. Thus, this decade review is more than an assessment of basic theory and research, it is also part of an ongoing debate about ideology and its role in the conceptualization of minority-family lifestyles.

The role of ideology is not unique to the field of the family or racial minorities. Under the rubric of the sociology of knowledge, it

*We wish to acknowledge our gratitude to Ken Nakagawa, Ralph Gomes, Dorothy Miller, Marvin Proson and Annie Williams for their assistance in writing this article.

**Department of Sociology, University of California, San Francisco, California 94143.
***Departments of Sociology and Chicano Studies, University of California, Riverside, California 92521.

has been asserted that the social location of the individual within a given society will influence the knowledge he possesses (Mannheim, 1936). Since the study of minority families has been dominated by white, middle-class males, a debate centering around the "insider-outsider thesis" has arisen (Merton, 1972; Staples, 1976a). One side contends that indigenous minorities possess a special capacity for understanding the behavior of their group, while the other side contends that the use of objective scientific methods nullifies the racial membership of the investigator as a significant factor. Those holding the latter view often choose to conceptualize the whole issue as a conflict between ideology and science (Dennis, 1976).

The argument is compounded by the division of minority family researchers into empiricists and nonempiricists. Many minority researchers have used the essay and qualitative analysis as their main tool in understanding minority families. In part, this is due to a desire for a broader understanding of the behavioral processes that animate the family life of American minorities. Since white males dominate the quantitative studies of minority families, they have often discredited their minority counterparts with the charge of being polemicists and substituting speculation and ideology for objective data. The white male's claim to a monopoly on objectivity is countered by Myrdal's (1944:1041) contention that "biases in social science cannot be erased simply by 'keeping to the facts' and by refined methods of statistical treatment of the data." Facts, he notes, and the "handling of data sometimes show themselves even more pervious to tendencies towards bias than does pure thought."

Questions of objectivity versus ideology would be beyond cavil were it not for the fact that for a very long time, minority families were treated pejoratively in the family literature. At the end of the sixties, the consensus was that minority families were negatively different from the middle-class Anglo family system. The source and nature of their deviance was never agreed upon beyond the fact that they generally constituted dysfunctional units and represented barriers to their group's mobility (Staples, 1971). Part of the problem in understanding minority families was the failure of researchers to distinguish between factors of class and culture in their family lifestyles. This also represented a methodological flaw. In an analysis of empirical research in the *Journal of Marriage and the Family* during the period of 1959 to 1968, it was found that only 7 percent of the *Journal's* articles reported on lower-class populations. In contrast, almost all the research on minority families, in the same period, had lower-class groups as the subject population (Lieberman, 1973:18).

While lower-class minority families were often compared to middle-class white families and found wanting, a central question persisted. That question might be best framed as: What is the relationship of the family to the larger society? Does the family simply respond passively to the forces it encounters or is it a unit that acts as a conduit for the mobility of its individual members? In other words, does the family structure determine social achievement or does social achievement influence the form of the family? Belief in the determinancy of family structure on social achievement was the prevalent position in the study of minority families for many years. It was this underlying attitude which gave the study of minority families more than theoretical implications. Since research findings can be and are translated into public policy that, in turn, impacts on the life chances of minority individuals, the study of minority families becomes extremely consequential. Thus, it is imperative that all views be given a fair hearing in the family literature.

THE BLACK FAMILY

At the end of the sixties, controversy was still raging over the Moynihan (1965) report. Moynihan's assertion that "at the root of the deterioration of Black society was the deterioration of the Black family" stimulated a plethora of theory and research. Over 50 books and 500 articles related to the black family were published in the last decade. That 10-year period produced five times more black family literature than had been produced in all the years prior to 1970. In the early stages of the decade, such research was primarily in response to the work of Frazier (1939), Moynihan (1965), and Rainwater (1966), who had uniformly depicted the lower-class black family as pathological. Subsequently, however, the researchers ex-

panded into studies of the black family as an autonomous unit.

Along with the expansion of black family research came the development of new theoretical constructs. Allen (1978) has identified three ideological perspectives in research done on the black family: the *cultural deviant* approach; the *cultural equivalent* approach; and the *cultural variant* approach. The cultural deviant approach viewed black families as pathological. The cultural equivalent perspective conferred a legitimacy upon black families as long as their family lifestyles conformed to middle-class family norms. The cultural variant orientation depicted black families as different, but functional, family forms. In an analysis of the treatment of black families in the research literature between 1965 and 1979, Haynes and Johnson (1980) discovered that, in the seventies, the literature shifted dramatically from the cultural deviant to the cultural equivalent perspective. The cultural variant perspective, which views the black family as a culturally unique, legitimate unit, continues to be underrepresented in mainstream journals. In fact, only in the predominantly black journals and in the special issue of the *Journal of Marriage and the Family* on black families does a cultural variant perspective prevail. These journals account for 74 percent of the articles published on the black family using such a perspective.

Theory

Since research on black families has as its dominant orientation the cultural equivalent approach, it would appear that the assimilation model guides most of the empirical studies. However, it remains the case that much research on the family is atheoretical. In the last decade, two new theoretical constructs were applied to the study of black families. The first and most common one is called the "Africanity" model. The underlying tenets of this model are that African traits were retained and are manifested in black styles of kinship patterns, marriage, sexuality, and childrearing, etc. (Staples, 1974; Nobles, 1978). While it is an axiom of human existence that no group loses all of its cultural heritage, the precise locus of African traits in black family lifestyles remains an empirical question. It is possible that the Africanisms that exist are so fused with American traits that it is impractical to seek specific behavioral patterns, values, and structural features that are uniquely African in origin. At this juncture the model remains on an abstract level, untested by any systematic research.

Another conceptual model applied to the study of black families is the "internal colonialism" approach. It has the advantage of bridging the cultural equivalent and cultural variant perspectives. By using the colonial analogy, it assumes that racial domination by outsiders can create weaknesses in a groups' family structure while acknowledging the existence of functional elements in its family system (Lieberman, 1973; Staples, 1978a). Research using this model has been slow in emerging, partly due to the problem of operationalizing the concept of internal colonialism with the kind of data readily available to social scientists. At this point in time, most of the works using this model have been theoretical essays or research which have used the colonial analogy in a serendipitous manner (Staples, 1976b).

Historical Research

Surprisingly, the most groundbreaking research on black families was conducted by historians. For years, the works of Frazier (1939) and Elkins (1968) had been accepted as the definitive history of black families and posited as a causal explanation of their contemporary condition. Based on traditional historical methods, using plantation records and slaveowner testimony, both men reached the conclusion that the family was destroyed under slavery and the culture of the slaves was decimated. The first historian to challenge that thesis was Blassingame (1972), whose use of slave narratives indicated that in the slave quarters black families did exist as functioning institutions and role models for others. Moreover, strong family ties persisted in face of the frequent breakups deriving from the slave trade. To further counteract the Frazier/Elkins thesis, Fogel and Engerman (1974) used elaborate quantitative methods to document that slaveowners did not separate a majority of the slave families. Their contention, also controversial, was that the capitalistic efficiency of the slave system meant it was more practical to keep slave families intact.

Continuing in the vein of revisionist historical research, Genovese (1974) used a mix of slaveholder's papers and slave testimony. Still, he concluded that black culture, through compromise and negotiation between slaves and slaveowners, did flourish during the era of slavery. Within the context of slavery, there was a variety of socially approved and sanctioned relationships between slave men and women. The alleged female matriarchy that was extant during that era is described by Genovese as a closer approximation to a healthy sexual equality than was possible for whites. It was the landmark study by Gutman (1976), however, that put to rest one of the most common and enduring myths about black families. Using census data for a number of cities between 1880 and 1925, he found that the majority of blacks, of all social classes, lived in nuclear families. Through the use of plantation birth records and marriage application, he concluded that the biparental household was the dominant form during slavery. More important than Gutman's compelling evidence that slavery did not destroy the black family was his contention that their family form in the past era had evolved from family and kinship patterns that had been given birth under slavery, a cultural form that was a fusion of African and American traits.

Social historians and historical demographers also made contributions to our understanding of black family history. Furstenberg and his colleagues (1975) investigated the origin of the female-headed black family and its relationship to the urban experience. Basing their analysis on samples from the decennial federal population manuscript schedules for the period from 1850 to 1880, they found that blacks were only slightly less likely to reside in nuclear households than were native whites and immigrants to Philadelphia. While these historical works have, in combination, challenged the Moynihan view that slavery created the conditions for black family disorganization, the prevalence of marital breakups at the hands of slaveowners means that many marriages were not that stable. Even the use of slave accounts does not eliminate bias in slave history. Many of the slave narratives were edited by Northern abolitionists and they constitute the reports of highly literate slaves.

Macrosociological Studies

The studies which focused on generalized aspects of the black family shared certain commonalities. Most of them were responding to the Moynihan thesis about the instability of black families. Additionally, they attempted to delineate the structure and function of black families. The goals may have been similar, but the perspectives, again, fell into one of Allen's (1978) typologies. Studies by Heiss (1975), Scanzoni (1971), and Willie (1976) would belong in the cultural equivalent category. Both Heiss and Scanzoni used quantitative analysis to illustrate that black families are stable, egalitarian, and functional units. They reached this conclusion by delineating how well black families meet the white, middle-class family ideal. Willie used qualitative analysis and examined a variety of black families. The poor black families were still depicted as less than healthy units. Hill's (1972) study of the strengths of black families would fall somewhere in a middle ground. Through the use of census data he demonstrated that black families, like white families, adhere to such sacosanct American values as strong work, achievement, and religious orientations. Conversely, he stressed the more unique traits of strong kinship bonds and role flexibility, although he did not link them to an autonomous cultural system.

An ongoing debate in black family studies revolves around the appropriate unit of analysis. A number of scholars have contended that the functions of the black family are carried out by the extended, rather than the nuclear, family unit. A number of studies have used the extended family as the focus of research (Aschenbrenner, 1975; Martin and Martin, 1978; McAdoo, 1978a; Shimkin *et al.*, 1978; Stack, 1974). Basically, they have delineated the use of kinship ties, both genealogical and fictive, as a resource for carrying out the functions of role modeling, socialization, mutual aid, and other support functions. The research by McAdoo (1978a) is especially significant because it illustrated that extended family ties transcend class boundaries. Her study of middle-class black families demonstrated that the kinship-help pattern remains strong after individuals have achieved mobility within the larger society.

Nevertheless, the viability of kinship networks must be questioned. First, there are

indications that they are statistically a defining form. The number of blacks in each household decreased in the last decade (Bianchi and Farley, 1979). Young females who bear children out-of-wedlock are more likely to move into their own household rather than become part of an extended family network (Bianchi and Farley, 1979). Moreover, as Stack (1974) has noted, kinship ties can militate against stable marital unions. The woman in a stable conjugal relationship uses her resources for her nuclear family, not her kinsmen. Thus, the kinsmen have vested interest in discouraging the development of stable nuclear families. We might also raise the question of how compatible kinship ties are with an industrialized society for some individuals. While it may facilitate mobility in some cases, it may impede it in others. The Parsonian (Parsons and Bales, 1955) notion that the extended family was supplanted by the nuclear family in order to create a mobile work force may have some validity. Individuals tied to an extended kinship system are also chained to the same geographical locale, which impairs the capacity to respond to different and better job opportunities.

Sex Roles

The burgeoning of the women's liberation movement gave rise to a number of books on black women. In the main, they were nonempirical works which focused on the role of black women in their community and the larger society (Cade, 1970; Staples, 1973; Noble, 1978; Rose, 1980). Among the better books was the study by Ladner (1971) of black teenage females growing up in a low-income urban community. Through the use of systematic open-ended interviews, participatory observation, and her own experiences, she explored how these young women coped with the forces of poverty and maintained a sense of positive identity. Many of the books on black women emphasized that while they were strong, due to the need to face adverse forces in the society, they were not overbearing matriarchs. At the end of the decade, a young black feminist broke ranks with her more conciliatory sisters and issued a broadsided attack on black male chauvinism in the black community (Wallace, 1979). It is possible that her book was the harbinger of the eighties and future literature on black sex roles will contain a feminist ideology.

The Family Life Cycle

Other than fertility behavior and child-socialization processes, the black family life cycle remains a largely neglected part of black family studies. The few studies of black dating and sexual behavior suggest a convergence of black and white behavioral modalties (Dickinson, 1975; Christensen and Johnson, 1978; Staples, 1978b; Porter, 1979). Almost all of the studies have used biracial comparisons and there has yet to be developed a systematic analysis of black dating and sexual codes. Mate selection norms and processes are equally ignored in the black family literature, despite the large proportion of unmarried blacks in our midst (Staples, in press). Perhaps it is the fact that the majority of adult blacks are unmarried that accounts for the paucity of research on black marriages and divorces (Chavis and Lyles, 1975; Hampton, 1979). At any rate, all we know is that the divorce rate for blacks increased by 130 percent in the last decade (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). While there were few studies of intraracial marriages, there were an abundance of books and articles on interracial marriages produced in the last decade (Henriques, 1975; Stember, 1976; Porterfield, 1977). Many of them were written in an *ad hominem* fashion and concluded that black/white marriages were problematic but viable. Heer's (1974) more careful analysis of census data documents the sharp increase in black male/white female pairings and the fairly high rate of dissolution of such unions.

Studies of childbearing and rearing practices in the black community reflect the same convergence of black and white behavior. The fertility rate of married black women declined at a slightly higher rate than did that of white women, with college educated black women continuing to have the lowest fertility rate of all groups (Farley, 1970; Kiser, 1970). The biggest racial difference in fertility rates continued to be in out-of-wedlock births occurring to black females. More than half of all black births now occur out-of-wedlock (Bianchi and Farley, 1979). In part, the increase in out-of-wedlock births is due to the decline in fertility rates among married black women. Many of the unwed mothers are teenagers and we have little in the way of research to inform us as to how their children are

being reared. There are indications that the informal adoption practices (Hill, 1977) of black families are no longer prevalent (Bianchi and Farley, 1979). Childrearing practices, in general, tend to be similar for black and white parents as does the level of the child's self-esteem (Halpern, 1973; Silverstein and Krate, 1975).

SUMMARY

The past decade has witnessed a basic transformation in ideology and research on the black family. Prior to the seventies, the common wisdom was that black families, in comparison to middle-class white families, were dysfunctional units which could not carry out the normative functions ascribed to that institution. During the last decade, the research emphasis shifted to the investigation of stable black families and their conformity to middle-class family norms. However, it was in this same decade that the economic gains that blacks accrued were translated into greater family stability for many, again raising the question of the relationship between black family stability and changes in the larger society. Another question concerns the interaction between cultural values and family organization; this has yet to be systematically examined by the proponents of the "Africanity" and "colonial" models. Finally, it would appear that we may need to go back to the drawing board on black family research. Based on the latest census data (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979), there has been a dramatic increase in teenage pregnancies, out-of-wedlock births, single-parent households, and marital dissolution among blacks of all social classes. Since these changes parallel changes in white families during the same period, it may presage a need to undergo a revolution in theory and research on the family as a viable institution for all groups in society.

THE CHICANO FAMILY

The last decade has witnessed a proliferation of research and writing on the Chicano family.[1] Prior to this time, social scientists demonstrated an intense interest in the Chicano family and generalizations concerning it abounded, but such generalizations were typically based on either meager or nonexistent data (Mirandé, 1977: 747; Kagan and Valdez, in press). In 1970, Miguel Montiel wrote an excellent critique of Mexican American family studies entitled "Social Science Myth of the Mexican American Family." At the risk of oversimplification, it seems fair to say that the bulk of research at the end of the previous decade could be characterized not only as negative and pejorative, but as lacking in empirical support. Montiel (1970: 62) has noted that such studies were based on a pathological model which "is inherently incapable of defining normal behavior and thus automatically labels all Mexican and Mexican American people as sick—*only in degree of sickness do they vary.*"

During the late 1960s and early 1970s a number of Chicano scholars sought to refute many of the stereotypes and myths perpetrated by pathological studies and to present a more sympathetic "inside" view of *la familia*. These sympathetic studies served as an important corrective, however, in their eagerness to counter negative perspectives, they tended to present an idealized and romanticized conception of the Chicano family. More recently, a body of research has emerged that is sympathetic to Chicanos and the nuance of Chicano culture, but which is increasingly rejecting of idealized and romantic stereotypes. While these approaches correspond roughly with the three chronological periods, adherents to each perspective are still to be found today.

Pejorative Depictions of the Mexican American Family

The traditional pejorative view of the Mexican American family can be traced to pathological studies of the Mexican family: works which see *machismo* as the key variable in explaining both the dynamics of Mexican family life and the emergence of Mexican national character (Bermudez, 1955; Gilbert 1959; Paz, 1961; Ramos, 1962; Diaz-Guerrero, 1975). Based on psychoanalytic assumptions, such studies have assumed the Mexican to be driven by feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, and a rejection of authority. *Machismo* is thus a compensation for powerlessness.

[1] There were only 17 articles on Hispanic families between 1950 and 1959, 57 in the following decade, and 155 in the past decade (Padilla *et al.*, 1978).

The pathological view of *machismo* and the rigid patriarchal family has been uncritically applied to Mexicans on this side of the border. The father is depicted as the unquestioned authority—the omnipotent, omniscient "lord and master" of the household who is free to come and go as he pleases and to maintain the same lifestyle that he did before marriage.

This empirically unsupported model of Chicano family life, until recently, has been the most prevalent in the social sciences (*cf.* Humphrey, 1944; Jones, 1948; Heller, 1966; and Peñalosa, 1968). According to this view, a man has complete freedom to drink, fight, and carry on extramarital relationships at will. William Madsen (1973: 22) has likened the Chicano male to a rooster: "The better man is the one who can drink more, defend himself best, have more sex relations, and have more sons borne by his wife." A man is seen as overly preoccupied with sex and with proving his masculinity and sexual prowess, and "the most convincing way of proving machismo and financial ability is to keep a mistress in a second household" (Madsen, 1973: 51).

Not surprisingly, the woman becomes a quiet, saintly, virginal creature who honors and obeys her husband at any cost. According to Madsen (1973: 22), the woman is the perfect counterpart to the man: "Where he is strong, she is weak. Where he is aggressive, she is submissive. While he is condescending toward her, she is respectful toward him." So strong is his control that she is expected to accept his marital transgressions and, if she does not, she is likely to be beaten. Moreover, "some wives assert that they are grateful for punishment at the hands of their husbands for such concern with shortcomings indicates profound love" (Madsen, 1973: 22).

This patriarchal family system also has been assumed to adversely affect children. Childrearing was presumed to be rigid and authoritarian. The Chicano family was thus the obverse of the middle-class Anglo familial ideal. Where the Anglo family was egalitarian and democratic, the Chicano family was rigid and authoritarian. While the Anglo family encouraged achievement, independence, and a sense of self-worth, the Chicano family engendered passivity and dependence and adversely affected normal personality development. Celia Heller (1966: 34-35) has argued that the Chicano family discouraged advancement "by stressing values that hinder mobility—family ties, honor, masculinity, and living in the present." Alvin Rudoff (1971: 236-237) has been even more severe in his condemnation of the Chicano family:

> The family constellation is an unstable one as the father is seen as withdrawn and the mother as a self-sacrificing and saintly figure. The Mexican American has little concern for the future, perceives himself as predestined to be poor and subordinate, is still influenced by magic, is gang-minded, distrusts women, sees authority as arbitrary, tends to be passive and dependent, and is alienated from the Anglo culture.

Another commonly assumed effect of the authoritarian and patriarchal structure is family violence. Carroll (1980) has contended that values and norms which are endemic to Chicanos result in a high level of family violence. The democratic Jewish American family, on the other hand, is believed to generate a very low level of violence. Whereas the Chicano family emphasizes severe discipline and violence as a mechanism for conflict resolution, the Jewish American family emphasizes

> the pursuit of knowledge and the use of the mind rather than the body. The value of intellectuality resulting from these values was proposed to lead to the favoring of articulateness, argumentativeness, and bargaining as a way to solve family disputes (Carroll, 1980:80).

Positive Depictions of the Chicano Family

An important outcome of minority movements of the 1960s was that minority scholars began to question social science depictions, which were generally negative or pejorative, and to offer new "insider" (Merton, 1972) perspectives that were not only sensitive and sympathetic to minority cultures but, possibly more valid and consistent with the realities of the minority experience. Given this thrust, it was perhaps inevitable that Chicanos, like blacks, would begin to seriously reevaluate social science perspectives on the Chicano family. Interestingly, while black scholars faced the task of refuting the myth of the "matriarchy" (Staples, 1971), Chicanos had to deal with *machismo* and the issue of male dominance. There emerged, then, a "sympathetic" or "revisionist" view of the Chicano family.

Miguel Montiel (1970, 1972) who not only rejected pathological formulations but suggested that they be replaced with an "appreciative" framework, has been one of the best and most incisive critics of traditional perspectives. Octavio Romano (1973: 52) has been similarly critical of social scientists for suggesting that Chicano parents, in effect, "are their children's own worst enemies" and that *la familia* Chicano is "un-American," potentially threatening our "democratic way of life" (1973:50). Alvirez and Bean (1976: 277) have responded to the traditional negative view by noting that "only a person who has never experienced the warmth of the Mexican American family would tend to see it primarily from a negative perspective." Another writer to take issue with the traditional view has been Nathan Murillo (1971), who has characterized the Chicano family as a warm and nurturing institution. According to Murillo, family is the most important unit in life and the individual is likely to put the needs of the family above his own. Rather than being rigid and authoritarian, the family is now seen as a stable structure where the individual's place is clearly established and secure. Cooperation among family members is also emphasized. The family "seems to provide more emotional security and sense of belonging to its members" (Murillo, 1971: 99). One's status within the family is determined by age and sex. While the father is the ultimate authority, other adults are also respected and honored as "being old and wise" (Goodman and Beman, 1971: 111).

Whereas *machismo* was previously synonymous with power, control, and violence, it is now equated with honor, respect, and dignity. "An important part of [the father's] concept of machismo . . . is that [of] using his authority within the family in a just and fair manner" (Murillo, 1971: 103). To misuse one's authority is to risk losing respect within the family and in the community.

Another Look at the Patriarchy: The Myth of Machismo

Although there appear to be both positive and negative perspectives of the Chicano family, a closer examination suggests a conversion of the two perspectives (Mirandé, 1977: 751). Both agree, for example, that male dominance is a persistent feature of the Chicano family, but one sees it as benevolent and the other as malevolent. Interestingly, the position is one held by both supporters and detractors of *la familia*, largely without the benefit of empirical support. When research findings have not supported traditional assumptions, there has been a tendency to resist them, especially by detractors of the Chicano family. "Findings which show that the Chicano family is more egalitarian than was previously assumed have been downplayed or explained away as resulting from increasing acculturation and assimilation" (Mirandé, 1979: 475).

A study of California migrant farm families by Hawkes and Taylor (1975) hypothesized that male dominance would prevail. They found instead, that the dominant pattern of decision making and action making among these migrant families was egalitarian. Their response to this unexpected finding was to turn to other factors such as acculturation, urbanization, and the decreasing dependence of women on their husbands in the United States. Only after such attempts proved unsuccessful did the authors begin to question the assumption of male dominance as a prevailing feature of Mexican and Chicano culture (Hawkes and Taylor, 1975: 811).

Hawkes and Taylor's findings are significant not so much for what they tell us about migrant farm families, but for suggesting a pattern which may not be anomalous or unique to the population studied but characteristic of Chicano families in general. Virtually every systematic study of conjugal roles in the Chicano family has found egalitarianism to be the predominant pattern across sociceconomic groups, educational levels, urban-rural residence, and region of the country. The Mexican-American Study Project, a pioneering effort and one of the most extensive and widely acclaimed studies of the Chicano people, found that Chicanos in Los Angeles and San Antonio did not fall into the traditional patriarchal pattern. Respondent families, especially younger ones and those with higher incomes, were much less patriarchal than previously assumed. There was egalitarianism with respect to the performance of traditional sex-typed tasks. although traditional male tasks appeared to be breaking down more than traditional female tasks, suggesting that Chicanos are increasingly assuming male roles. They found, nonetheless, that sex, age, and income

differences were not significant and concluded that "the most striking finding relates not to internal variations in the departure from traditional sex specializations, but rather to the conspicuous presence of a basically *egalitarian* division of household tasks" (Grebler *et al.*, 1970: 362-363).

A more recent study of 100 married couples in Fresno, California, also uncovered a basically egalitarian pattern of decision making (Ybarra, 1977). While Ybarra found that conjugal role relations ranged from a patriarchal pattern to a completely egalitarian one, the most prevalent pattern was one in which the husband and wife shared in decisions (Ybarra, 1977:2):

> A large number of Chicano husbands helped their wives with household chores and child care. Also, the Chicanos interviewed were not as obsessed with the idea of machismo as has been suggested in the literature. The overwhelming majority of Chicano husbands preferred to participate in social and recreational activities with their wives and children. Overall, the data indicated that the majority of Chicano wives played an important and/or equal part in most facets of conjugal role relationships.

Factors such as level of acculturation, income, or education were not significantly related to the type of role relationships prevalent in the family. In fact, the only factor that significantly affected the role relationships exhibited was female employment outside the home, with families with working wives demonstrating a more egalitarian pattern relative to decision making, sharing of household tasks, and the caring of children. While couples who are already more egalitarian may be more predisposed to have a working wife, the mere fact of the wife's employment outside the home appears to require adjustments in marital roles and a shift toward a more egalitarian pattern. Yet, Chicanos can work and acquire more power in the family without assimilating or rejecting their ethnicity (Baca Zinn, 1980).

A study of self-report perceptions of spousal dominance among Kansas City Chicanos and blacks similarly failed to support the traditional view of *machismo* in the Chicano family. Cromwell and Cromwell, (1978) in studying spousal dominance in decision making and conflict resolution, found that the most common pattern among Chicanos was egalitarianism, rather than male dominance.

After undertaking an extensive review of literature on power and control in the domestic sphere, Maxine Baca Zinn (1975, 1976) has gone a step beyond studies which suggest an egalitarian pattern by proposing that the Chicano family is, in fact, mother-centered. While the family may present a facade of patriarchy because cultural values dictate that the male should be honored and respected as titular head of the household, the day-to-day functioning of the family revolves around *la mujer*. The male has primary responsibility and power outside of the household, but the domestic sphere is the woman's domain (Baca Zinn, 1976). Other studies have suggested that the woman's influence is especially strong relative to children. Mothers not only perform many domestic tasks, but they have primary responsibility for the caring of children and for setting limits on their behavior (Tuck, 1946; Heller, 1966; Rubel, 1966; Goodman and Beman, 1971; Sotomayor, 1972). Ultimately, "as the *madrecita*, entitled to respect and homage, she may actually dominate, in all matters that affect her children" (Tuck, 1946: 123).

The questioning of the rigid and authoritarian nature of the Mexican and Chicano family has extended beyond conjugal roles to relations between parents and children. Recent research suggests that parent-child relations may be warm and nurturing rather than cold and rigid. An important assumption that has been challenged is that fathers are necessarily more aloof and authoritarian than mothers. An observational study of Mexican family roles found fathers to be playful and companionable with children (Burrows, 1980). Rubel (1966: 66) similarly concluded that "without exception, direct observations note the warmth and affection exhibited by fathers with their young sons and daughters, children under ten years of age." Goodman and Beman (1971: 12) were also impressed with the strength and warmth of affection demonstrated in the Chicano family, noting that "the strength of intra-family affection declared by Barrio children is conspicuous by contrast with responses of the Negro and Anglo children we interviewed." Finally, Bartz and Levine (1978: 709) reported that it was black, rather than Chicano parents who were "typified as expecting early autonomy, not allowing wasted time, being both highly supportive

and controlling, valuing strictness and encouraging egalitarian family roles." Black fathers were also most controlling. Significantly, of the three groups, Chicano parents were found to be most supportive of increasing permissiveness in parent-child relations (Bartz and Levine, 1978: 715).

The Chicano Family: Social and Demographic Characteristics

There are a number of structural and demographic features which distinguish the Chicano family from the dominant American form. One distinctive feature is its high fertility relative not only to white but to black families (Alvirez and Bean, 1976: 280-281). Not surprisingly, the Chicano population is a youthful one with a median age of about 21, compared to a median of 30 years for the rest of the population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978: 2). Whereas Chicano families average approximately four persons per family, other families average three (1978: 11). The vast majority of Chicano children under 18 years of age (81 percent) live with both parents in intact families, 16 percent live with the mother, and only 1 percent live with the father (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978: 46). Chicano families are about as likely to be maintained by a woman (16 percent) as are other Hispanic or Anglo families, but far less likely to be maintained by a woman than are Puerto Rican families (37 percent). The income of Chicano families is substantially lower than for other families. The median income for Chicano families in 1978 was $12,000, compared to $17,000 for families in the population as a whole (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1978). Twenty-two percent of all Mexican-origin families are below the poverty level, whereas only 9 percent of families not of Spanish origin are classified as poor (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978: 15).

The marital status of Chicanos does not differ significantly from the general population, with approximately 60 percent of the population in each group classified as married, but Chicanos have a higher proportion of single and a lower proportion of widowed or divorced persons (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978: 3). Thus, while Chicanos are about as likely to be married as other groups, they are less likely to be divorced. The divorce rate shows greater stability for Chicanos, especially Chicano men (Alvirez and Bean, 1976; Eberstein and Frisbie, 1976).

Since intermarriage has been presumed to be an important index of assimilation, there has been much interest in the outmarriage rates of Chicanos. The conclusions of earlier studies that intermarriage rates of Chicanos suggested a "breakdown of ethnic solidarity in an increasingly open system" (Grebler *et al.*, 1970: 471) have been called into question by more recent research. While the overall trend during the present century has been toward intermarriage in the Southwest (Bean and Bradshaw, 1970), the trend appears to have stabilized and, perhaps, reversed in recent years. Murguia and Frisbie (1977: 387) concluded after examining recent trends in intermarriage that:

> If the level of Spanish-surname intermarriage is conceived as the most conclusive, objective indicator of the degree of assimilation . . . , it seems probable that the Mexican American population will continue to represent a distinct sociocultural entity for some time to come.

ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES

This minority group has largely been neglected in the family literature. Theory on their family life is nonexistent and empirical studies are sparse and clustered in a few areas. This is due, in part, to their small numbers and geographical concentration. There are approximately 1.5 million individuals of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Thai, and East Indian ancestries living in the United States (Yamauchi, 1979). In total they constitute less than 1 percent of the American population and represent fewer than 10 percent of our minority groups. Most of them are concentrated in Hawaii and the Western part of the United States. In addition, they tend to be underrepresented among social scientists and there are few insiders to develop theory and carry out research on their family lifestyles. Another possible reason is that, as a group, they are not perceived as a "problem" in American society or as very different in their family lifestyles. In the past, Asian men were stereotyped as wily and devious, the women as exotic and mysterious. That image essentially has changed to one of a hard-working, conforming, cohesive family group which is a carrier of a traditional culture similar to that of middle-class Anglo families (Sue and Kitano, 1973). Certainly, they fit better the family ideal of middle-class Americans than do the other minorities. Based

on the positive indices of success and family stability, they not only are equal to white Americans, but often fare better in terms of educational achievement, median family income, and marital stability (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1980).

The new stereotype of Asians as model minorities can be deleterious because it masks the problems they face. While they obviously have different characteristics than other minorities, the variations are not evenly spread across generations in their culture. Asian Americans can be separated chronologically into three groups: pre-1924 immigrants, American-born, and recent immigrants. Many of the pre-1924 immigrants, for instance, were males who came to this country alone and were unable to establish families because of immigration laws that prohibited Asian migration to this country for a long period of time (Lyman, 1968). That group, and the more recent immigrants, have not shared equally in the successes of American-born Asians. Even the American-born Asians are subject to tensions in their family life that remain unexplored by family researchers. Many Asian families contain at least two full-time workers, more than the average American family, and must use their income to support an extended family that is larger than most middle-class nuclear families (Wong, 1976).

Acculturation and assimilation seem to be key concepts in understanding Asian family life. This is particularly true of the younger, American-born group, which has adapted more strongly to American values and traditions (Kuroda *et al.*, 1978). In comparison to the other minorities, Asians have more conservative sexual values, a lower fertility rate, fewer out-of-wedlock births, and more conservative attitudes toward the role of women (Monahan, 1977; Braun and Chao, 1978; Leonetti, 1978). The adoption of American values, however, has proved to be a mixed blessing for young Asian Americans. It has created a schism in the Asian community based on generational differences in language, customs, and values. It makes it difficult to maintain generational continuity and ethnic cohesiveness. Nowhere is this more evident than in the high rates of out-marriages among younger Japanese and Chinese Americans (Weiss, 1970; Kikumura and Kitano, 1973). A majority of third generation Japanese Americans marry non-Japanese mates. The majority of out-marriages have involved Japanese women, although the rate for Japanese males is increasing. While many factors account for this high rate of intermarriage, a primary reason is the more acculturated Asian woman's dissatisfaction with the more traditional Japanese male's limited attitude toward women (Kikumura and Kitano, 1973; Braun and Chao, 1978).

Another index of acculturation is child-rearing practices. Studies generally have shown a congruity between third-generation Japanese socialization techniques and American styles of childrearing. However, differences based on some residue of Japanese culture remain. Caudill and Frost (1973) found that young Japanese mothers do more vocal lulling, more breast and bottle feeding, more carrying and more playing with the baby than do American mothers. Connor (1974) also discovered that the legacy of Japanese culture can still be found in third generation Japanese Americans. When compared with whites of the same age and education, the Japanese Americans were significantly different; they were less aggressive, had a greater need for succor and order, and a markedly lesser need for companionship. Johnson (1977) also reported that the Japanese American kinship system operates on a more obligatory basis than the optional basis found in the American kinship system. Her research revealed an increase in kinship contact and sociability among third-generation Japanese American families, despite their social mobility and high degree of assimilation.

In sum, culture seems to be the key element in Asian family life. Their traditional culture stressed the importance of the family unit at the expense of the individual, and socialization processes in the family created patterns of self-control which facilitated the achievement of societal goals. These cultural values were very consonant with traditional American values and made them adaptable to the American family system. Class membership does not seem as important since many of the Asian immigrants brought with them values associated with the middle-class: *i.e.*, an emphasis on education and a capitalist orientation (Kitano, 1969). However, there are indications that many of these

middle-class values are declining among the general American population. With their high degree of acculturation, younger Asian Americans face a clash of generations and a lack of ethnic cohesiveness that may entail a high cost.

NATIVE AMERICAN FAMILIES

While all our minority groups have certain commonalities, Native Americans have several problems which are unique to their particular group. The other minorities have a homeland that theoretically provides a symbolic identity with some other nation. Native Americans have no ties to any other geographical entity. As a group, they are more widely dispersed across North America and are more likely to reside in rural and isolated areas. Furthermore, they are more unalterably opposed to assimilation and integration into mainstream society and culture than any other minority group (Price, 1976). Even within the Native American group, there is a vast amount of diversity. They speak more than 252 languages and are organized into 280 different tribal groupings (Wax, 1971). Given the existence of these esoteric traits, they cannot be viewed as a monolithic group whose family lifestyles can be easily studied.

In reviewing the family literature on Native Americans, we are hampered by several factors. There is no such institution as a Native American family. There are only tribes, and family structure and values will differ from tribe to tribe. Despite the attempt to impose Western family models on them, various family forms still exist among the different tribal groupings (Unger, 1977). These forms range from polygamy to monogamy, matrilineality to patrilineality (McAdoo, 1978). Most of literature that is extant can be found in social work and mental health journals. These articles primarily focus upon Native American families as cultural deviants constituting a problem for the larger society. Another body of literature consists of anthropological studies, which again raises the insider-outsider issue. Unlike other minority groups, research done on Native Americans is almost exclusively monopolized by white Americans. Since anthropologists have been outsiders in Native American culture, the few existing Native American social scientists have been very critical of outsider perspectives on Native American family life (Redhorse *et al.*, 1978). Oftentimes the outsiders could neither speak the language, nor even locate the living quarters of many Native Americans. In the words of Dorothy Miller (1975: 7), a Native American, "most of us look upon 'surveys' and 'research' as being tools of our suppression and withhold data from white investigators."

In a general sense, Native Americans most closely approximate black American families. Both groups are characterized by a high fertility rate, out-of-wedlock births, a strong role for women, female-headed households, and high rates of unemployment (Witt, 1974; Unger, 1977; U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1980). For many Native Americans, the extended family is the basic unit for carrying out family functions. This is often true despite the absence of extended kin in the same household. Children are actually raised by relatives residing in different, noncontiguous households. The existence of multiple households sharing family functions is quite common. Redhorse (1979) discovered one community where 92 percent of the elderly population resided in independent households, but maintained close functional contact with their children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. They fulfilled traditional family roles on a daily basis. Fictive kin are also incorporated into the extended family system. An individual, for example, may become a namesake for a child through formal ritual and subsequently assume family obligations and responsibilities for childrearing and role modeling (Momaday, 1976).

In the move from tribal reservations to the urban frontiers, Native Americans often become more isolated and must confront certain vicissitudes of city life without their traditional support system. Certainly, the proportion of Native American living off reservations has rapidly increased. In 1930, only 10 percent lived in urban areas. By 1970 that number had grown to 45 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1974). In their study of 120 urban Native American families, Miller (1975) and her Native American researchers discovered that: (1) one third were female-headed; (2) 27 percent were receiving public welfare; (3) they had an average of three children; and (4) only one third

had an adequate income. They found that traditional childrearing techniques were still used by most of the parents. Native American children continued to be trained for independence at significantly earlier ages than either white or black urban children. Their findings support a bicultural model which holds that families who are at home in both the Native American and white world have a greater ability to survive and adapt to the city than do families who only are comfortable in one culture or who feel alienated from both worlds.

The status of Native American families remains in a state of transition. High unemployment and a desire for a better life have propelled many from the reservations into the urban centers. Once in the cities, they encounter a clash of cultures between Native American ways and the norms of city life. Moreover, they cannot rely on the extended family system which serves as an anchor of Native American culture and life on the reservations. Hence, there is a constant tension as they seek equilibrium in an alien and hostile environment. In a follow-up study of the urban Native American families, Miller (1980) found that 40 percent had returned to the reservation. Some returned because of a dislike for the city, others went back because they could not cope with its demands. Some, however, made a successful bicultural adaptation and returned to their community with leadership and technical skills and an appreciation and understanding of both worlds.

SUMMARY

Our decade review of research and theory on minority families illustrates the fact that there has been an increase in both the quantity and quality of the family literature. Some problems remain. Research continues to be clustered in specific areas while other areas are neglected. In the case of Asian and Native American families, basic studies need to be conducted. Future research needs to focus on the minority family unit as an autonomous system with its own norms, rather than comparing it to or contrasting it with the majority culture using white, middle-class standards. Only by this means will the insider-outsider dichotomy dissipate as a salient issue. Furthermore, both qualitative and quantitative approaches are necessary in the study of minority families. Since these groups remain outside the mainstream of society, the nuances of their cultures cannot be thoroughly understood through the sole use of one-dimensional empirical research. At the same time, we need the solid grounding of quantitative data. Different populations need to be sampled in order to ascertain class and cultural variation within and between minority groups. There is little we can say about class differences among minority families, since few studies have used class controls or accounted for its effect. Finally, while there is no validity to the idea that the family system of a given minority is pathological, there also is little credibility to a philosophical school that assumes that all aspects of minority family life are strong and healthy and that no weaknesses of any kind exist. What we need is theory and research that can give us a balanced account of both the strengths and weaknesses of minority families. That remains our task for the next decade.

REFERENCES

Allen, W.
1978 "Black family research in the United States: A review, assessment and extension." Journal of Comparative Family Studies 9 (Summer): 167-189.

Alvirez, D., and F. Bean
1976 "The Mexican American family." Pp. 271-292 in Charles H. Mindel and R. Habenstein (Eds.), Ethnic Families in America. New York: Elsevier.

Aschenbrenner, J.
1975 Lifelines: Black families in Chicago. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Baca Zinn, M.
1975 "Political familism: Toward sex role equality in Chicano families." Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts 6(Winter): 13-26.
1976 "Chicanas: Power and control in the domestic sphere." De Colores 2(Fall):19-31.
1980 "Employment and education of Mexican-American women: The interplay of modernity and ethnicity in eight families." Harvard Educational Review 50 (February):47-62.

Bartz, K., and E. Levine
1978 "Childrearing by black parents: A description and comparison to Anglo and Chicano parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40 (November):709-719.

Bean, F., and B. Bradshaw
1970 "Intermarriage between persons of Spanish and non-Spanish surname: Changes from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century." Social Science Quarterly 51(September): 389-395.

Bermudez, M.
1955 La Vida familar del mexicano. Mexico, D.F.: Antigua Libreria Robredo.
Bianchi, S., and R. Farley
1979 "Racial differences in family living arrangements and economic well-being: An analysis of recent trends." Journal of Marriage and the family 41(August):537-552.
Blassingame, J.
1972 The Slave Community. New York:Oxford University Press.
Braun, J., and H. Chao
1978 "Attitudes toward women: A comparison of Asian-born Chinese and American Caucasians." Psychology of Women Quarterly 2(Spring):195-201.
Burrows, P.
1980 "Mexican parental roles: Differences between mother's and father's behavior to children." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research, Philadelphia (February).
Cade, T.
1970 The Black Woman:An Anthology. New York: Signet Books.
Carroll, J. C.
1980 "A cultural-consistency theory of family violence in Mexican-American and Jewish-ethnic groups." Chapter 5 in M. A. Straus and G. T. Hotaling (Eds.), The Social Causes of Husband-Wife violence. Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press.
Caudill, W., and L. Frost
1973 "A comparison of maternal care and infant behavior in Japanese-American, American and Japanese families." Unpublished paper, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland.
Chavis, W., and G. Lyles
1975 "Divorce among educated black women." Journal of the National Medical Association. 67(March):128-134.
Christensen, H., and L. Johnson
1978 "Premarital coitus and the southern black: A comparative view." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40(November):721-732.
Connor, J.
1974 "Acculturation and family continuities in three generations of Japanese Americans." Journal of Marriage and the Family 36(February):159-168.
Cromwell, V., and R. Cromwell
1978 "Perceived dominance in decision making and conflict resolution among black and Cnicano couples." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40(November):749-759.
Dennis, P.
1976 "Theories of the black family: The weak-family and strong-family schools as competing ideologies." Journal of Afro-American Issues 4(Summer/Fall):315-328.
Diaz-Guerrero, R.
1975 Psychology of the Mexican: Culture and Personality. Austin:University of Texas Press.
Dickinson, G.
1975 "Dating behavior of black and white adolescents before and after desegregation." Journal of Marriage and the Family 37(August): 602-608.
Eberstein, I., and W. P. Frisbie
1976 "Differences in marital stability among Mexican Americans, blacks and Anglos: 1960 and 1970." Social Problems 23(June):609-621.
Elkins, S.
1968 Slavery: A problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
Farley, R.
1970 Growth of the Black Population. Chicago: Markham.
Fogel, W., and S. Engerman
1974 Time on the Cross. Boston:Little, Brown and Company.
Frazier, E. F.
1939 The Negro Family in the United States. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
Furstenberg, R., Hershberg, T., and J. Modell
1975 "The origins of the female headed black family: The impact of the urban experience." Journal of Interdisciplinary History 5(Spring): 211-233.
Genovese, E.
1974 Roll, Jordan, Roll. New York:Pantheon Press.
Gilbert, G. M.
1959 "Sex differences in mental health in a Mexican village." The International Journal of Social Psychiatry 3(Winter):208-213.
Goodman, M. E., and A. Beman
1971 "Child's-eye-views of life in an urban barrio." Pp. 109-122 in N. Wagner and M. Haug (Eds.), Chicanos: Social and Psychological Perspectives. St. Louis:C. V. Mosby Company.
Gordon, M.
1964 Assimilation in American Life. New York:Oxford University Press.
Grebler, L., Moore, J. W., and R. C. Guzman
1970 The Mexican American People. New York:The Free Press.
Gutman, H.
1976 The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom: 1750-1925. New York:Pantheon Books.
Halpern, F.
1973 Survival: Black/White. New York: Pergamon Press.
Hampton, R.
1979 "Husband's characteristics and marital disruption in black families." Sociological Quarterly (September):255-266.
Hawkes, G., and M. Taylor
1975 "Power structure in Mexican and Mexican American farm labor families." Journal of Marriage and the Family 37(November): 807-811.
Haynes, T., and L. Johnson
1980 "Changing perspectives on black families in empirical research: Selected journals: 1965-1979." Unpublished manuscript, Washington, D.C., The Urban Institute.

Beer, D.
1974 "The prevalence of black-white marriage in the United States, 1960 and 1970." Journal of Marriage and the Family 35(February): 246-258.

Beiss, J.
1975 The Case of the Black Family: A Sociological Inquiry. New York:Columbia University Press.

Beller, C.
1966 Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York:Random House.

Benriques, F.
1975 Children of Conflict: A Study of Interracial Sex and Marriage. New York:E. P. Hutton.

Hill, R.
1972 The Strengths of Black Families. New York: Emerson-Hall Publishers.
1977 Informal Adoption. Washington, D.C.:National Urban League Research Department.

Humphrey, H.
1944 "The changing structure of the Detroit Mexican family: An index of acculturation." American Sociological Review 9(December):622-626.

Johnson, C. L.
1977 "Interdependence, reciprocity and indebtedness: An analysis of Japanese American kinship relations." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39(May):351-364.

Jones, R. C.
1948 "Ethnic family patterns: The Mexican family in the United States." American Journal of Sociology 53(May):450-452.

Kikumura, A., and H. Kitano
1973 "Interracial marriage: A picture of the Japanese Americans." Journal of Social Issues 29 (Spring):67-81.

Kagan, S., and D. Valdez
In press "Mexican American family research: A critical review and conceptual framework." De Colores.

Kiser, C.
1970 Demographic Aspects of the Black Community. New York:Milbank Memorial Fund.

Kitano, H.
1969 Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:Prentice-Hall.

Kuroda, Y., Suzuki, T., and C. Hayashi
1978 "A cross-national analysis of the Japanese character among Japanese-Americans in Honolulu." Ethnicity 5(March):45-59.

Ladner, J.
1971 Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman. Garden City, New York:Doubleday.

Leonetti, D. L.
1978 "The biocultural pattern of Japanese-American fertility." Social Biology 25(Spring): 38-51.

Lieberman, L.
1973 "The emerging model of the black family." International Journal of Sociology of the Family 3(March):10-22.

Lyman, S.
1968 "Marriage and the family among Chinese immigrants to America, 1850-1960." Phylon 29(Winter):321-330.

Madsen, W.
1973 The Mexican-Americans of South Texas (2nd ed.). New York:Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Mannheim, K.
1936 Ideology and Utopia. New York:Harcourt, Brace, and World.

Martin, E., and J. Martin
1978 The Black Extended Family. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.

McAdoo, H.
1978a "Factors related to stability in upwardly mobile black families." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40(November):762-778.
1978b "Minority families." Pp. 177-185 in J. Stevens and M. Mathews (Eds.), Mother/Child, Father/Child Relationships. Washington, D.C.:National Association of Young Children.

Merton, R. K.
1972 "Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge." American Journal of Sociology 78(July):9-48.

Miller, D.
1975 American Indian Socialization to Urban Life. San Francisco:Institute for Scientific Analysis.
1980 "The Native American family: The urban way." Pp. 441-484 in E. Corfman (Ed.), Families Today. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office.

Mirandé, A.
1977 "The Chicano family: A reanalysis of conflicting views." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39(November):747-756.
1979 "Machismo: A reinterpretation of male dominance in the Chicano family." The Family Coordinator 28(October):473-479.
in press "Machismo: Rucas, chingasos, y chingaderas." De Colores.

Momaday, N. S.
1976 The Names. New York:Harper and Row, Publishers.

Monahan, T.
1977 "Illegitimacy by race and mixture of race." International Journal of Sociology of the Family 7(January-June):45-54.

Montiel, M.
1970 "The social science myth of the Mexican American family." El Grito: A Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought 3(Summer):56-63.
1973 "The Chicano family: A review of research." Social Work 18(March):22-31.

Moynihan, D. P.
1965 The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office.

Murguia, E., and W. P. Frisbie
1977 "Trends in Mexican-American intermarriage: Recent findings in perspective." Social Science Quarterly 58(December):374-389.

Murillo, N.
1971 "The Mexican American family." Pp. 97-108 in N. Wagner and M. Haug (Eds.), Chicanos:

Social and Psychological Perspectives. St. Louis:C. V. Mosby Company.

Myrdal, G.
1944 An American Dilemma. New York:Harper and Row, Publishers.

Noble, J.
1978 Beautiful, Also, Are the Souls of My Black Sisters: A History of the Black Woman in America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:Prentice-Hall.

Nobles, W.
1978 "Toward an empirical and theoretical framework for defining black families." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40(November): 679-698.

Padilla, A. M., Olmedo, S., and R. Perez
1978 "Hispanic mental health bibliography." Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center, University of California, Los Angeles, Monograph No. 6.

Parsons, T., and R. Bales
1955 Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois:The Free Press.

Paz, O.
1961 The Labyrinth of Solitude. New York:Grove.

Peñalosa, F.
1968 "Mexican family roles." Journal of Marriage and the Family 30(November):680-689.

Porter, J.
1979 Dating Habits of Young Black Americans. Dubuque, Iowa:Kendall/Hunt.

Porterfield, E.
1977 Black and White Mixed Marriages. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Price, J.
1976 "North American Indian families." Pp. 248-270 in C. Mindel and R. Habenstein (Eds.), Ethnic Families in America. New York:Elsevier.

Rainwater, L.
1966 "The crucible of identity: The lower class Negro family." Daedalus 95(Winter):258-264.

Ramos, S.
1962 Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Redhorse, J. G., R. Lewis, M. Feit, and J. Decker
1978 "Family behavior of urban American Indians." Social Casework 59(Winter):67-72.
1979 "American Indian elders: Needs and aspirations in institutional and home health care." Unpublished manuscript, Arizona State University.

Romano, O. I.
1973 "The anthropology and sociology of the Mexican Americans: The distortion of Mexican American history." Pp. 43-56 in O. Romano, (Ed.), Voices: Readings From El Grito. Berkeley:Quinto Sol Publications.

Rose, L.
1980 The Black Woman. Beverly Hills:Sage Publications.

Rubel, A. L.
1966 Across the Tracks: Mexican-Americans in a Texas City. Austin:University of Texas Press.

Rudoff, A.
1971 "The incarcerated Mexican-American delinquent." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 62(June):224-238.

Scanzoni, J.
1971 The Black Family in Modern Society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shimkin, D., E. Shimkin, and D. Frate
1978 The Extended Family in Black Societies. Chicago:Aldine Publishing Company.

Silverstein, B., and R. Krate
1975 Children of the Dark Ghetto. New York: Praeger Publishing Company.

Stack, C.
1974 All Our Kin. New York:Harper and Row, Publishers.

Staples, R.
1971 "Towards a sociology of the black family: A theoretical and methodological assessment." Journal of Marriage and the Family 33(February):119-138.
1973 "The Black Woman in America." Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
1974 "The black family revisited: A review and a preview." Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences 20(Spring):65-78.
1976a Introduction to Black Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
1976b "Race and colonialism: The domestic case in theory and praxis." The Black Scholar 7(June): 37-50.
1978a "Mental health and black family life." Pp. 73-94 in L. Gary (Ed.), Mental Health: A Challenge to the Black Community. Philadelphia: Dorrance.
1978b "Race, liberalism—conservatism and premarital sexual permissiveness: A biracial comparison." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40(November):78-92.
in press The World of Black Singles: Changing Patterns of Male/Female Relations. Westport. Connecticut:Greenwood.

Stember, C.
1976 Racial Sexism. New York:Elsevier.

Sotomayor, M.
1971 "Mexican American interaction with social systems." Social Casework 52(May):316-322.

Sue, S., and H. Kitano
1973 "Asian American stereotypes." Journal of Social Issues 29(Spring):83-98.

Tuck, R.
1946 Not With the Fist. New York:Harcourt, Brace, and World.

U.S. Bureau of the Census
1974 "A study of selected socio-economic characteristics of ethnic minorities based on the 1970 Census, Vol. III. American Indians." Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office.
1978 "Persons of Spanish origin in the United States: March, 1977." Series p-20, No. 329. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office.
1979 "The social and economic status of the black population in the United States: An historical

view, 1790-1978." Series p-28, No. 80. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Commerce
1978 "U.S. Spanish origin population now 12 million census survey shows." August 21, Washington, D.C.:Commerce News.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
1980 "Health status of minorities and low-income groups." Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office.

Unger, S.
1977 The Destruction of American Indian Families. New York:Association on American Indian Affairs.

Wallace, M.
1979 Black Macho and the Myth of the Super Woman. New York:Dial Publishing.

Wax, M. L.
1971 Indian Americans: Unity and Diversity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:Prentice-Hall.

Weiss, M.
1970 "Selective acculturation and the dating process: The patterning of Chinese-Caucasian interracial dating." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(May):273-278.

Willie, C. V.
1976 A New Look at Black Families. Bayside, New York:General Hall.

Witt, S. W.
1974 "Native women today." Civil Rights Digest 6(Spring):30-34.

Wong, L.
1976 "The Chinese experience: From yellow peril to model minority." Journal of Social Issues 9(Fall):33-41.

Ybarra, L.
1977 "Conjugal role relationships in the Chicano family." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.
in press "Marital decision-making and the role of machismo in the Chicano family." De Colores.

Yamauchi, J. S.
1979 "Asian American communications: The women's self-concept and cultural accommodations." Paper presented at the conference on the Minority Woman in America, San Francisco (March).

Journal of Educational Psychology
1981, Vol. 73, No. 4, 524-532

Copyright 1981 by the American Psychological Association, Inc.
0022-0663/81/7304-0524$00.75

Relationship of Family Constellation and Schooling to Intellectual Performance of Mexican American Children

Richard R. Valencia and Ronald W. Henderson
University of California, Santa Cruz

Richard J. Rankin
University of Oregon

The relationship of 13 family constellation and sociocultural variables to intellectual performance was examined for a sample of 190 Mexican American preschool children from low-income families. Variables were reduced through a factor analysis that produced four independent variables. Intellectual performance was then predicted using an MAXR stepwise multiple regression procedure that generates a new model for each variable entered. The best single factor predictor of intellectual performance, as measured by the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities, was a language/schooling factor that consisted of language of child and parents, parents' schooling attainment, and country (Mexico or the United States) in which parents were educated; and the best two factor model added socioeconomic status to the prediction. Family constellation, consisting of family size and birth order, constituted a clearly separate and distinct factor that contributed less than 3% of the variance in intellectual performance. The relationship of cultural variations to predictions based on the Zajonc and Markus confluence model are discussed.

Social scientists have shown a long-standing interest in the possible influences of family size, ordinal position of siblings, and other family constellation variables on the behavior and development of children (Bradley, 1968). Research on this topic has examined the influence of family constellation variables on personality (Koch, 1954) as well as cognitive outcomes. The question of whether intellectual eminence is primarily attributable to family constellation factors (e.g., Breland, 1973) or socioeconomic factors that tend to covary with family size (Schooler, 1972, 1973) has been debated for a long period of time, but recently there has been a sudden upsurge in interest in the topic.

Renewed interest in the influence of family variables on intellectual attainment has been sparked by the work of Zajonc and Markus (1975). With an elegant simplicity of explanation, the confluence model proposed by these investigators purports to account for the simultaneous relationship of birth order, family size, and spacing between siblings to intelligence. The basic proposition is that the intellectual environment of the family has a direct influence on the intellectual development of the children being socialized in that context. The intellectual environment consists of the sum of the intellectual levels of all members of the family, divided by the number of family members. The concept of intellectual level employed in the model is not adjusted for age differences in mental performance and is therefore more similar to the concept of mental age than to IQ (Page & Grandon, 1979). In effect, the intellectual environments of children from large families and those families in which there are closely spaced siblings are diluted by the presence of the siblings. Confluence theory does not predict well for only children or for last-born children, both of whom perform more poorly than the model would expect. The post hoc explanation proposed for this discrepancy is that children in these two positions do not enjoy

This research was supported in part by Contract 90-C-1777 from the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and in part by Faculty Research funds granted by the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Richard R. Valencia, Oakes College, University of California at Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California 95064.

the opportunity to consolidate their knowledge by teaching younger siblings.

One reason the confluence model has received serious attention from educators is because Zajonc (1976) has suggested that national declines in Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores merely reflect the movement of children from an era of relatively large families through the schools. Educators could feel quite relieved if patterns of declining intellectual achievement are attributable to demographic factors instead of faulty education. Furthermore, the model promises a reversal in the downward trend of aptitude test scores as children from a wave of smaller families begin to be reflected in the national statistics.

A number of recent studies have failed to find support for confluence theory (Davis, Cahan, & Bashi, 1977; Grotevant, Scarr, & Weinberg, 1977; Melican & Feldt, 1980; Page & Grandon, 1979; Velandia, Grandon, & Page, 1978). Support from studies providing some degree of confirmation has been relatively weak and inconsistent (Breland, 1974; Dandes & Dow, 1969; Rees & Palmer, 1970; cited in Melican & Feldt, 1980).

Page and Grandon (1979) found general confirmation for the confluence model in analyses of data for large samples from Colombia (South America) and the United States. However, their results were congruent with the findings of Zajonc and Markus (1975) only when they used those investigators' aggregated data approach to analysis. When Page and Grandon (1979) subjected their data to a more appropriate analysis of individual rather than aggregated data, the variance in intelligence accounted for by family configuration variables dropped to 1% for one sample and 5% for the other. Moreover, Page and Grandon found that socioeconomic status (SES) and ethnic variables accounted for the largest path coefficients in a path analysis.

The majority of the tests of the confluence model conducted to date have employed samples of secondary school or college age, and cross-cultural data are limited (Davis et al., 1977; Velandia et al., 1978). Studies of United States ethnic minority subcultures are similarly lacking. In light of current interest in the confluence theory and its predictions, it is important to examine the relationship of family characteristics to intellectual development for children whose schooling is still ahead of them, and who represent ethnic groups and socioeconomic levels that often perform relatively poorly on intellectual measures. The present research was designed to provide such an analysis for economically disadvantaged Mexican American children. Children from this background generally perform below national norms on standardized mental measures, although there is substantial variability within the population. These children also come from a cultural background in which large families are valued. Information on the relative amount of variance in intellectual performance contributed by relatively fixed (e.g., family configuration) variables that may be dictated by cultural values versus modifiable factors such as schooling should add a needed dimension to theories attempting to account for the relationship between family characteristics and intelligence.

Method

Subjects

The original sample for this study consisted of 320 Mexican American preschool children enrolled in 20 preschools in eight towns/cities in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, California. The sample was drawn from Head Start, church related, public school affiliated, and private, nonprofit preschools. All the schools were oriented toward serving children of low-income families.

After testing the children on an intelligence/ability test, family background information was obtained by home interviews with the mothers. Due to an inability to locate or schedule interviews with 59 mothers, only 261 mothers of the 320 children were subsequently interviewed. The present design called for intact families, or families in which both parents were present during the majority of the child's development. Of the families in the present analysis, 95% were intact at the time data were collected, but in 5% of the cases a father was not present in the family at that time. Subjects from families in which there was no record of a father were not included in this study. In addition, only monolingual Spanish-speaking or monolingual English-speaking children were included, reducing the final sample size to 190 families.

There were 84 boys (44%) and 106 girls (56%) in the sample; the mean age was 55 months, with a range of 33 to 69 months. Based on preschool teacher and examiner judgments and preferred language (dominant language) of the child, the intelligence/ability test was administered in English to 71 children (37%) and in Spanish to 119 (63%).

The mean educational attainments of the mothers and fathers were 8.1 and 7.6 years, respectively; the range and standard deviation for the mothers were 0–17 years and 3.8 years, respectively; the range and SD for the fathers were 0–18 years and 3.9 years, respectively. For the mothers, 90 (47%) had had formal schooling in the United States, and 100 (53%) had been schooled in Mexico. The fathers had a similar pattern, with 63 (33%) schooled in the United States, and 127 (67%) in Mexico. Of the total number of mothers and fathers (n = 380), 216 (57%) had been schooled exclusively in Mexico, 133 (35%) had been schooled exclusively in the United States, 19 (5%) had had schooling in both countries, and 12 (3%) had received no schooling. For parents who had been schooled in both countries, country of schooling was determined by the country in which the subject had had the majority of his or her schooling. For parents who had a zero level of attainment, country of schooling was determined by the country in which the parents were born and had spent their formative years. Regarding the primary or only language spoken at home, 49 (26%) of the parents spoke English and 141 (74%) spoke Spanish. Based on the Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (Hollingshead & Redlich, 1958), the mean socioeconomic status of the families was extremely low. The mean class level was 4.4 (5 is the lowest on a scale of 1–5); the range was 1–5. The Hollingshead Index also yields a Social Position Score, a weighted and summed score based on occupation and years of schooling.

Instruments and Procedure

The test of intellectual performance administered was the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities (MSCA; McCarthy, 1972). The MSCA was specifically designed to measure the abilities of young children (2½ to 8½ years old). There are 18 separate tests grouped into six scales: Verbal, Perceptual-Performance, Quantitative, General Cognitive, Memory, and Motor. Because of time limitations, the three exclusive motor tests were not administered. The MSCA also yields a global index that is cognitive in nature. The General Cognitive Index (GCI) indicates the child's overall cognitive functioning. The GCI, a scaled score, has a mean set at 100 and a standard deviation of 16.

The MSCA was chosen because it included novel items that seem to appeal to young children, and particularly because the norming sample was stratified on the basis of age, sex, geographic region, father's occupation, and ethnicity. The standardization and norming of the test have been evaluated favorably (Kaufman, 1977). Although inclusion of minority populations in the norm sample does not address the issue of possible cultural bias in test item content, it does indicate an awareness of sociocultural differences within the society that is lacking in older tests, such as the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. Although the absolute number of Mexican American children included in the norming sample was actually small, there is some evidence that the MSCA has good properties of reliability and concurrent validity when administered to Mexican American children (Davis & Rowland, 1974; Davis & Walker, 1976; Valencia & Sheehan, Note 1) and black children (Kaufman & Kaufman, 1973; Kaufman and Dicuio, 1975). In addition, the MSCA has been shown to be reliable for low-income Mexican American children, although it does appear to be less reliable for Spanish-speaking than for English-speaking groups (Valencia & Sheehan, Note 2). It was judged that this difference in reliability could not be overcome by selecting a different dependent measure.

In the present study, the testing of the children was done at their preschools by four, trained, female bilingual Mexican American research assistants. The language of test administration was determined by a combination of the following: (a) teacher judgment; (b) child preference; and (c) examiner judgment as determined by a "rapport establishing" time a day prior to testing. The children who were considered to be non-English-speaking (Spanish monolingual) were administered a carefully translated version of the regular MSCA. Since the design of the study called for monolingual English and monolingual Spanish children, those children who were tested bilingually were not considered as subjects. After administration, the MSCA protocols were subject to content analysis (e.g., children's verbal responses) to ensure that the children were not utilizing language switching and mixture.

Information about the family was obtained through home interviews with the mothers. The interviews, conducted by the four research assistants, were done in the preferred language of the mother. The following information was obtained: (a) number and birthdates of siblings, (b) marital status of mother, (c) schooling attainment and location of the schooling for mother and father, (d) primary language spoken at home by parents, and (e) occupation of head of household.

Design

The 13 independent variables studied were age of child, sex of child, number of children in the family, birth order of children, language of test administration, father present, schooling attainment of mother, country of mother's schooling, schooling attainment of father, country of father's schooling, language spoken in home by parents, social position score, social class level. The dependent variable was the GCI of the MSCA.

The 13 independent variables were intercorrelated and factor analyzed using the SPSS system (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Brent, 1975). Because there was no a priori reason to assume that the factor scores desired should be totally uncorrelated, a principal factor solution as suggested by Harman (1976) was obtained, with squared multiple correlations in the diagonal. The minimum eigenvalue was set at 1, and orthogonal rotation was obtained following the varimax procedure. As a procedural check, factor scores were also obtained using a principal components solution. As expected, the correlations across methods by factors approximated unity. (One to four factors were generated.)

The dependent variable (GCI) was predicted utilizing the muliple regression stepwise procedure from the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) procedure (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, & Helwig, 1976). The specific procedure was MAXR, which generates a new model for each variable entered. Each successive model is independent of the previous models and is the one that produces the maximum n variable R^2.

Factor scores were utilized to reduce the number of independent variables while solving colinearity problems often present in the family environmental data. Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973) suggest that factor scores are a powerful and simple way to improve the efficiency of multiple regression equations.

The use of factor scores may mask to some extent the effect of individual variables. The trade-off is clarity when there is extensive colinearity in the original matrix. An ideal solution to the colinearity problem would be to use very large samples and analyze each subpopulation separately. The nature of the current sample precludes this possibility.

Results

Table 1 shows the intercorrelations, means, and standard deviations for the independent and dependent variables. Table 2 shows the four factors that emerged predicting 74% of the variance in the predictors of family variables.

The first factor, which explains 42% of the common variance, has its highest loadings with language of the test, family language, years of schooling for the parents, and country of parents' schooling. This factor is named the language/schooling factor (LS).

The second factor, explaining 13% of the common variance, is best explained by the two socioeconomic scores (social position score and class). Thus it is named socioeconomic status (SES). It is clearly separated from the first factor.

The third factor, which explains 10% of the common variance, is best explained by family size and position in the family. It is called the family size factor (FS).

The fourth factor, explaining 9% of the common variance, is difficult to interpret, although it is best explained by sex of the child. It is defined as a residual.

Table 3 presents the results of the MAXR system of regression analysis. Factor scores are used as independent variables, and the dependent variable is GCI.

The best one-variable model was the first factor (LS, $R^2 = .0677$); 6.77% of the variance in GCI is predicted by the combination of family language and educational attainment levels.

The best two-variable model consisted of Factor 1 (LS) with the addition of Factor 2 (SES; $R^2 = .1035$). The improvement in R^2 due to SES is .0358; 10.35% of the variance

Table 1: *Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Among Major Variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Age of child		.144	.062	−.021	.067	−.105	.020	.007	.145	.097	.049	−.029	−.040	−.064
2. Sex of child			.121	.124	−.057	−.146	−.024	−.089	−.046	−.048	−.032	.023	−.004	.166
3. Number of children				.891	−.191	−.006	−.424	−.244	−.351	−.186	−.229	.339	.315	−.238
4. Birth order of child					−.134	−.068	−.384	−.231	−.375	−.179	−.206	.322	.289	−.209
5. Language of test						−.009	.611	.749	.543	.681	.713	−.461	−.374	.293
6. Father present							−.020	−.042	−.009	−.094	−.129	.011	.008	.058
7. Schooling of mother								.773	.619	.531	.533	−.486	−.398	.327
8. Country of mother's schooling									.571	.653	.621	−.460	−.381	.241
9. Schooling of father										.702	.601	−.730	−.627	.301
10. Country of father's schooling											.760	−.559	−.465	.232
11. Language of the home												−.489	−.436	.276
12. Social position score													.925	−.302
13. Social class level														−.273
14. McCarthy General Cognitive Index														
M	.558		2.942	2.170	.374	.974	8.137	.474	7.600	.332	.258	64.000	4.437	94.868
SD	.498		1.591	1.570	.485	.161	3.909	.501	3.847	.472	.483	12.422	.760	13.728

Note. Coded variables are set as 1 = English speaking, female, father present, U.S.A. education; 0 = Spanish speaking, male, father absent, Mexico education.

Table 2
Four-Factor Varimax Solution for the Family Constellation and Schooling Variables Related to Intellectual Performance of Mexican American Children

Variable	Factor 1	2	3	4
Age of child	.045	−.030	−.008	.354
Sex of child	−.072	−.014	.083	.306
Number of children	−.161	.150	.901	.122
Birth order of child	−.126	.144	.931	.076
Language of test administration	.836	−.155	−.017	−.003
Father present	−.060	−.022	−.015	−.317
Schooling of mother	.706	−.190	−.293	−.088
Country of mother's schooling	.868	−.130	−.098	−.139
Schooling of father	.598	−.509	−.244	.136
Country of father's schooling	.766	−.301	−.052	.211
Language spoken in the home	.757	−.230	−.091	.189
Social position score	−.371	.913	.155	.014
Social class level	−.277	.869	.145	−.014

Note. Factor 1 = language/schooling; Factor 2 = socioeconomic status; Factor 3 = family size; Factor 4 = residual.

in GCI is explained by the first and second factors, and 3.58% of the variance is uniquely explained by SES.

The best three-variable model consisted of the factors listed above with the addition of Factor 3 (FS; $R^2 = .1314$). The improvement in R^2 due to FS is .0279; 13.14% of the variance in GCI is explained by the three-variable model, with 2.79% of the variance uniquely due to Factor 3, family size and birth order.

Table 3
Max R^2 Improvement for Dependent Variable General Cognitive Index

Best variable model factor	R^2	F	Significance of removing (F)	$p <$
1 variable	.0677	13.66		.0003
LS			13.66	.0003
2 variable	.1035	10.80		.0001
LS			13.37	.0003
SES			7.47	.0069
3 variable	.1314	9.38		.0001
LS			13.39	.0003
SES			7.61	.006
FS			5.96	.0155
4 variable	.1316	7.01		.0001
LS			13.24	.0004
SES			7.58	.0065
FS			5.99	.0153
Residual			.05	.8157

Note. LS = language/schooling; SES = socioeconomic status; FS = family size.

The best four-variable model did not show a significant improvement over the best three-variable model.

A comparison of children from English-speaking and Spanish-speaking homes revealed a statistically significant difference on GCI performance in favor of the English-speaking children, $t(188) = 4.13$, $p < .0002$, although it should be noted that both groups scored within the normal range of performance. The mean for English-speaking children was 100.06, with an SD of 13.62; the mean for Spanish-speaking children was 91.74, with an SD of 12.88.

It is acknowledged that differences in the quality of preschool programs might affect the cognitive performance of children and that a relationship could exist between the characteristics of families and the types of preschools their children attend. Unfortunately, no suitable data on program quality were available, but careful inspection of descriptive data on a school-by-school basis suggested that the small GCI differences across preschools were primarily associated with the variables constituting Factors 1 and 2. The sample size did not permit a formal subanalysis across schools.

Discussion

The single most powerful predictor of mental performance was a language/schooling factor consisting of the language

of the home, the language in which the test was administered, the level of educational attainment of the mother and father, and the country where the parents were educated. This relationship indicated that the most competent children were those who came from homes in which the dominant language was English, who were tested in English rather than Spanish, whose parents were educated in the United States rather than Mexico, and whose parents had attained the highest levels of formal education among those represented in the sample.

The best two-factor model combined data on socioeconomic status with the language/schooling factor. Although the SES factor does include information on the educational level of the family, it was clearly distinct from the others, suggesting that the occupational component may not be highly correlated with education and that the occupational scores may be serving to separate this factor from the other factors. This would be consistent with Laosa's (in press) finding of lower correlations between occupational status and educational attainment for Mexican American families in Los Angeles, as compared with Anglo American families in the same area. The contribution of the SES factor in the present research was undoubtedly limited by a restriction in range. All of the families were relatively poor, but there appeared to be two basic kinds of families within a population that is often considered quite homogeneous. In one type of family the parents were schooled in Mexico, generally spoke Spanish at home, and had a relatively limited degree of formal education. The second type of family environment was one in which the parents usually spoke English, had been educated in the United States, and had completed more formal schooling than their counterparts in the first type of family. The pattern of relationships between family variables and intellectual performance was such that the children from the second type of family achieved at a higher level than children from families displaying the first of these clusters of characteristics.

It appears that parents who have been educated in the United States and who have relatively higher levels of education may be transmitting to their children more of the culture of the school than their Mexico-educated counterparts. The kinds of knowledge and skills valued in school culture are reflected in intellectual measures such as the MSCA. This interpretation is consistent with Laosa's research indicating that apparent ethnic differences in the mother/child interaction styles of Mexican American and Anglo American mothers are largely attributable to differences in the level of formal education attained by the mothers.

In the present study, the amount of variance accounted for by predictor variables increased to 13.1% when a factor that included family size and birth order (FS) was added to the analysis. This clearly separate and conceptually distinct factor added 2.8% to the variance explained in performance on the GCI.

It seems clear from these results that the family configuration variables of family size and birth order contribute a small but distinct proportion of the variance in intellectual performance among this sample of children. The proportion of variance explained by family size and birth order in the present study is consistent with the results of a number of studies (e.g., Grotevant et al., 1977; Page & Grandon, 1979) reporting that those variables accounted for between 1% and 5% of the variance in mental capability, with the mode being about 2%.

The separation of socioeconomic status from variables that clustered together in a language/schooling factor in the analysis conducted for the present investigation are of particular interest and potential importance for attempts to clarify the relationship of family environmental variables to intellectual performance. Socioeconomic status and cultural variables are often confounded in studies attempting to identify environmental contributions to intellectual functioning. The present results suggest that although socioeconomic status characteristics did contribute to variation in intellectual performance, that contribution was relatively independent of a set of environmental influences that may be attributable to cultural differences or modernization influences. Laosa (1981) has noted an increasing participation of Mexican American women in education, and he sees this trend as part of a process of cultural change that Levine (Note 3) has called "modernization." Laosa speculates that this modernization process

may serve to reduce or eliminate existing differences in interaction patterns of Anglo American and Chicano families. Given the inherent colinearity of location and level of formal education in the data for the present study, the analysis of individual variables does not make it possible to disentangle the possible influences of cultural loading in the test items versus the effects of modernization. This remains an important subject for future study.

This research adds to a growing body of studies (Belmont, Stein, & Zybert, 1978; Davis et al., 1977; Grotevant et al., 1977; Melican & Feldt, 1980; Nuttall, Nuttall, Polit, & Hunter, 1976; Rankin, Gaite, & Heiry, 1979; Velandia et al., 1978) that have failed to provide substantial support for the confluence model proposed by Zajonc and Markus (1975). That these investigations have not confirmed the large contribution of birth order, spacing, and family size to intellectual performance should not be surprising when one considers the nature of Zajonc and Markus's analysis, their sample, and the dependent measure used in their original test of the confluence model. First, Grotevant et al. (1977) have criticized the confluence model by arguing that aggregated data minimize or ignore the study of between- and within-groups sources of variance that might help explain individual differences in intellectual performance. Zajonc and Markus (1975) have claimed that birth order and spacing accounts for most of the variance in intellectual performance. However, when aggregated data are used, the sources of variance between and within families for a population are largely undetected. Page and Grandon (1979) have pointed out that analyses leading to individual predictions are generally of greater interest to psychologists and educators than predictions for aggregated groups. Second, the Dutch sample employed by Zajonc and Markus in the development of the confluence model was decidedly atypical, consisting of subjects who were *in utero* at the time of a severe famine in Holland, which required pregnant mothers to subsist on 450 calories or less per day (Belmont & Marolla, 1973). Given the atypical nature of this sample, a number of plausible rival hypotheses might explain the results obtained by Zajonc and Markus. For example, a "selective survival" hypothesis is advanced by Stein, Susser, Saenger, and Marolla (1972). It is possible that the survivors of the famine might have been selected from fetuses unimpaired from the shock of maternal starvation. In essence, the exposed fetus either survived unimpaired or died.

Finally, the modified version of the Raven Progressive Matrices that served as the dependent measure on which the Zajonc and Markus conclusions were based is suspect. The reduction in the number of items and raw score transformations into six classifications called "class scores" raises concerns about validity and the loss of discrimination in transforming raw scores to "class" (interval) scores.

The finding in the present study that children who performed best on the GCI were those from homes in which English was the preferred language should not be taken to suggest that limited and non-English-speaking Mexican American children should be immersed in English language training programs. The present data are descriptive only, and, of course, correlational findings do not indicate causality. The question of what educational programs would be most effective for children from the backgrounds investigated in this study is an important topic for other investigations, but the present data shed no light on that issue.

Since cultural groups vary in their attitudes toward family size, the policy implications of data conforming to the confluence model are unclear. There would be difficult ethical ramifications for any public policy aimed at changing the value orientations of particular ethnic groups. Furthermore, there is evidence that the relationship between family size and mental test performance may be nonlinear in non-Western societies in which large families are highly valued (Rankin et al., 1979), or where external influences, such as schooling, may change traditional patterns of influence within the family context (Davis et al., 1977). With a Samoan sample, Rankin and his associates (Rankin et al., 1979) found that the relationship between family size and intellectual level was neither negative nor linear.

In Samoan culture the most intellectually competent children were from families near the mean size valued within the culture (M = 6.46).

The relationship between the schooling of parents and the intellectual functioning of their children suggests that public policy can do something concrete to exert a positive influence on the intellectual performance of children from culturally diverse backgrounds. It seems increasingly clear that the effects of schooling may be more important than some interpretations of the effects of schooling have suggested. Cross-cultural data on schooling and cognition (Greenfield, 1978; Stevenson, Parker, Wilkinson, Bonnevaux, & Gonzales, 1978) indicates that formal education has an important effect on the development of cognitive skills, even if it does not equalize those skills across different populations. The present research suggests that the results of education are passed on by parents to their children. We interpret the present results to suggest that skills and concepts that are implicit in school culture, and in the content of mental tests, may be passed on to children in proportion to the parents' own exposure to the culture of the schools. This does not necessarily imply that ethnic groups must give up the values of their own culture in order to do this. Some research (cf., Henderson & Merritt, 1968) has suggested that Mexican American families who participated most in activities of the mainstream culture also evidenced the highest levels of participation in the activities of the Mexican culture.

Finally, it should be noted that a number of studies (cf., Schooler, 1972; Page & Grandon, 1979) have demonstrated that the apparent relationship between family size and mental test performance of children is better explained as a function of socioeconomic status than family size. In the present investigation separate factors were identified for social class and a language/schooling constellation of variables that seemed to characterize cultural variations within the sample. Future investigations of the specific environmental processes that characterize these differences are needed to identify the specific environmental learning experiences that are associated with the more general language and schooling variables used in this study.

Reference Notes

1. Valencia, R. R., & Sheehan, R. *Concurrent validity of the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills for Mexican American children.* Manuscript submitted for publication, 1981.
2. Valencia, R. R., & Sheehan, R. *Stability of the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities over a one-year period for Mexican American children.* Manuscript submitted for publication, 1981.
3. Levine, R. A. *Women's education and maternal behavior in the Third World: A report to the Ford Foundation.* Cambridge, Mass.: Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard Graduate School of Education, August 1978.

References

Barr, A. J., Goodnight, J. H., Sall, J. P., & Helwig, J. T. *A user's guide to Statistical Analysis System 76.* Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, 1976.

Belmont, L., & Marolla, F. A. Birth order, family size and intelligence. *Science*, 1973, *182*, 1096–1101.

Belmont, L., Stein, Z. A., & Zybert, P. Child spacing and birth order: Effect on intellectual ability in two-child families. *Science*, 1978, *202*, 995–996.

Bradley, R. W. Birth order and school-related behavior: A heuristic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, *70*, 45–51.

Breland, H. M. Birth order effects: A reply to Schooler. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1973, *80*, 210–212.

Breland, H. M. Birth order, family configuration, and verbal achievement. *Child Development*, 1974, *45*, 1011–1019.

Dandes, H. M., & Dow, D. Relation of intelligence to family size and density. *Child Development*, 1969, *40*, 641–644.

Davis, D. J., Cahan, S., & Bashi, J. Birth order and intellectual development: The confluence model in light of cross-cultural evidence. *Science*, 1977, *196*, 1470–1472.

Davis, E. E., & Rowland, T. A replacement for the venerable Stanford-Binet? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1974, *30*, 517–521.

Davis, E. E., & Walker, C. Validity of the McCarthy Scales for Southwestern rural children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1976, *42*, 563–567.

Greenfield, P. M. Commentary and discussion. In H. W. Stevenson, T. Parker, A. Wilkinson, B. Bonnevaux, & M. Gonzales, Schooling, environment, and cognitive development: A cross cultural study. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1978, *43*(3, Serial No. 175).

Grotevant, H. D., Scarr, S., & Weinberg, R. A. Intellectual development in family constellations with adopted and natural children: A test of the Zajonc and Markus model. *Child Development*, 1977, *48*, 1696–1703.

Harman, H. H. *Modern factor analysis* (3rd rev.).

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Henderson, R. W., & Merritt, C. B. Environmental backgrounds of Mexican American children with different potentials for school success. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1968, *75*, 101–106.

Hollingshead, A. B., & Redlich, F. C. *Social class and mental illness*. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Kaufman, A. S. A McCarthy short form for rapid screening of preschool, kindergarten, and first grade children. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 1977, *2*, 149–157.

Kaufman, A. S., & Dicuio, R. F. Separate factor analyses of the McCarthy Scales for groups of black and white children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1975, *13*, 10–18.

Kaufman, A. S., & Kaufman, N. L. Black-white differences at ages 2½ to 8½ on the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities. *Journal of School Psychology*, 1973, *11*, 194–204.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Pedhazur, E. J. *Multiple regression in behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Koch, H. L. The relation of primary mental abilities in five- and six-year-olds to sex of child and characteristics of his sibling. *Child Development*, 1954, *25*, 209–223.

Laosa, L. M. Maternal teaching strategies in Chicano and Anglo American families: The influence of culture and education on maternal behavior. *Child Development*, in press.

Laosa, L. M. Maternal behavior: Sociocultural diversity in modes of family interaction. In R. W. Henderson (Ed.), *Parent-child interaction: Theory, research, and prospects*. New York: Academic Press, 1981.

McCarthy, D. *McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities*. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1972.

Melican, G. J., & Feldt, L. S. An empirical study of the Zajonc-Markus hypothesis for achievement test score decline. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1980, *17*, 5–19.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G. Steinbrenner, K., & Brent, D. H. *Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nuttall, E. V., Nuttall, R. L., Polit, D., & Hunter, I. B. The effects of family size, birth order, sibling separation and crowding on academic achievement of boys and girls. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1976, *13*, 217–223.

Page, E. B., & Grandon, G. M. Family configuration and mental ability: Two theories contrasted with U.S. data. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1979, *16*, 257–272.

Rankin, R. J., Gaite, A. J. H., & Heiry, T. Cultural modification of effect of family size on intelligence. *Psychological Reports*, 1979, *45*, 391–397.

Rees, A. H., & Palmer, F. H. Factors related to change in mental test performance. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 1970, *3* (2 Pt 2).

Schooler, C. Birth order effects: Not here, not now. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1972, *78*, 161–175.

Schooler, C. Birth order effects: A reply to Breland. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1973, *80*, 213–214.

Stein, Z., Susser, M., Saenger, G., & Marolla, F. Nutrition and mental performance. *Science*, 1972, *178*, 708–713.

Stevenson, H. W., Parker, T., Wilkinson, B., Bonnevaux, B., & Gonzales, M. Schooling, environment, and cognitive development: A cross cultural study. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 1978, *43*(3, Serial No. 175).

Velandia, W., Grandon, G. M., & Page, E. B. Family size, birth order, and intelligence in a large South American sample. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1978, *15*, 394–416.

Zajonc, R. Family configuration and intelligence. *Science*, 1976, *192*, 227–236.

Zajonc, R., & Markus, G. B. Birth order and intellectual development. *Psychological Review*, 1975, *82*, 74–88.

Received September 19, 1980 ■

One reading that was to have been appended to this module was not yet published at the time of this printing. It is "School, Occupation, Culture, and Family: The Impact of Parental Schooling on the Parent-Child Relationship" by Luis M. Laosa, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1982 (December), 74(6).